21055

NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

CANADA

NAME OF AUTHOR: JAMES G LERGESSNER

TITLE OF THESIS: A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF PAUL GOODMAN'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE REFORM MOVEMENT IN EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY: ALBERTA

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED: Ph. D

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1974

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed) James G. Lergessner

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

15 THE BOULEVARDE,
BRIBIE ISLAND, 4507,
QUEENSLAND, AUSTRALIA

DATED 29th November 1973

NL-91 (10-68)

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF PAUL GOODMAN'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE REFORM MOVEMENT IN EDUCATION: A HUMAN NATURE INTERPRETATION

by

© JAMES G. LERGESSNER

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING 1974

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "A Critical Evaluation of Paul Goodman's Contribution to the Reform Movement in Education: A Human Nature Interpretation," submitted by James G. Lergessner in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Harry Garfinkle
....
Supervisor

Allen Pearson
....

Daniel Wangler
....

[illegible] M. Smith
....

....
External Examiner

Date November , 1973

ABSTRACT

Following a careful perusal of Goodman's works, this study attempts to evaluate much of Goodman's thought, including his educational thought. After tracing in biographical fashion Goodman's development as a radical humanist and artist in American society, the researcher uncovers an interpretation—referred to as a human nature interpretation—which he believes adequately and accurately provides a rationale not only for explaining most of Goodman's thought, but also his contribution to educational reform, particularly progressive education reform.

As presented by the writer, this human nature interpretation is conceived to possess two distinctive characteristics. It offers, on the one hand, Goodmanesque versions of man as he is functioning in the present social order, and, on the other, of man as he once was in the past and could become again in a new social order which is yet to be created. Utilizing these twofold classifications in order to propose a firm connecting link between Goodman's thought and his views concerning human nature, such topics as Goodman's intellectual heritage, his anarchist ideas, his analysis of youth movements, and his educational proposals and recommendations are discussed in the main body of this study. When this task is complete, the validity of applying a human nature interpretation—especially one which affords Goodman's writings a meaning, impetus, clarity, and direction—has hopefully been established.

By way of conclusion, the writer restates the general thesis pursued throughout his study, assesses Goodman's overall views and

assumptions relating to human nature and educational reform, and charts his own personal, pessimistic path for the educational future.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

> Those of us working on Goodman have tried with some reasonable success to provide mutual aid.
>
> Robert Meredith

I would like to express my appreciation to Harry Garfinkle for capably and gracefully steering me through this difficult rite of initiation. His psychic reinforcement, thoughtful advice, and able commentaries tendered during the harrowing ordeals of self-imposed torture, and moments of physical despair and drain or loss of spirit, shall never fade or be lost from memory. In addition, I wish to thank Allen Pearson, Burton Smith, and David Wangler for the assistance they extended, both individually and collectively, during the reading of the manuscript. Professor Pearson's perceptive insights have left their imprint on many of the pages of this work. So have those of my typist, Kay Baert, who laboured tirelessly and devotedly to project the text from its embryonic stages to its present, completed state. Finally, the writer salutes those Goodmanites in North America and elsewhere (see Appendix II) who tranformed this occasionally solitary academic pilgrimage into a journey offering mutual aid.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Abstract iii

Acknowledgements v

Foreword xi

CHAPTER

I. THE LONELINESS OF THE LONG-DISTANCE AGITATOR: PAUL GOODMAN, RADICAL EDUCATOR 1

Footnotes to Chapter I 26

II. THE HUMAN NATURE INTERPRETATION 31

Rationale for the Study 31

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study 34

Goodman's Human Nature Conception: A Key to Understanding his Thought 34

Man as he Could Become: His Basic Nature 37

Man as he Is: His Repressed Nature in Present Society 44

Man as he Once Was: His Basic Nature in the Past 52

Implications of Man as he Is in Present Society: Restoring the Right Proportions 56

Implications and Consequences of Man as he Once Was and Could Become: the Relationship Between Man's Basic Nature and the Rise and Development of a New Social Order 57

Footnotes to Chapter II 60

CHAPTER Page

III. ANALYSES AND ASSUMPTIONS IMPLICIT IN GOODMAN'S THOUGHT: THE EARLY AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL TRADITION IN ACTION 67

The American Intellectual Tradition: Visions of Man as he Once Was and Could Become 67

Crisis and Dissent: the Emergence of the American Intellectual Tradition 70

Solving the Crises: Unblocking the American Intellectual Tradition 78

Upholders of the American Intellectual Tradition in the Present Society: the Dissenting Youth 86

Overall Implications of the American Intellectual Tradition in Action: Man as he Is in Present Society as Opposed to Man as he Could Become 93

Footnotes to Chapter III 96

IV. GOODMAN'S POLITICAL VALUES AND ORIENTATIONS: ANARCHISTIC STRAINS IN HIS THINKING 101

Man as he Could Become: Extending the Realms of Free Action 101

Man as he Once Was: the Intellectual Heritage of Goodman's Anarchism 104

Man as he Is: His (Anti-Anarchist) Functioning in Present Society 107

Anarchistic Implications and Outcomes of Man as he Is: Restoring the Right Proportions 111

Anarchistic Implications and Consequences of Man as he Could Become and Once Was: the Rise of an Anarchist Social Order 115

CHAPTER Page

Footnotes to Chapter IV 117

V. THE EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT OF WHICH GOODMAN FORMS A PART: THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION REFORM, 1890-1972 120

The General Nature and Purpose of Progressive Education Reform 121

The Tenor of Progressive Education Reform, 1890-1970 125

Success and Failure in Progressive Education Practice: School Reality versus Progressive Rhetoric 137

The Legacy of Paul Goodman: 1960-1972 142

The Neo-Progressive Revolt 149

Footnotes to Chapter V 156

VI. GOODMAN'S CRITIQUE OF FORMAL SCHOOLING: A PLEA FOR INCIDENTAL EDUCATION 162

The Historical Perspective: Man as he Was 165

The Pedagogical Perspective: Man as he Could Become 169

The Social-Psychological Perspective: Man as he Is 177

CHAPTER Page

Implications and Consequences of Goodman's Critique of Schooling: Man and the Educational Process as it Was 186

Implications and Consequences of Goodman's Critique of Schooling: Man and the Educational Process as it Could Become 187

Implications and Consequences of Goodman's Critique of Schooling: Man and Schools as they Are 189

Overall Implications from the Three Perspectives 191

Footnotes to Chapter VI 193

VII. GOODMAN'S QUEST FOR VIABLE ALTERNATIVES IN EDUCATION 197

The Nature of Goodman's Alternatives in Education: Images of What Man Was and Could Become 198

Characteristics of Goodman's Alternatives in Education: General Educational Proposals and Specific Learning Arrangements 200

Overall Implications of Goodman's Educational Proposals and Learning Arrangements: Visions of Man as he Once Was and Could Become 228

Footnotes to Chapter VII 231

CHAPTER Page

VIII. ASSUMPTIONS UNDERLYING GOODMAN'S VIEW OF HUMAN NATURE AND EDUCATIONAL REFORM: ASSESSMENT AND IMPLICATIONS 237

Restatement of the Thesis 237

Assessment and Implications of Goodman's View of Man and Human Nature: Man as he Is, As Opposed to Man as he Could Become or Was 238

Assessment and Implications of Goodman's Overall View of Human Nature: Assumptions Underlying His Conceptions of Man in His Surrounding Environment 240

Assessment and Implications of Goodman's Educational Proposals and Recommendations 250

Attaining the Impossible Dream 259

Footnotes to Chapter VIII 264

Epilogue 269

Bibliography 275

Appendices 290

FOREWORD

Having gone through some turbulent stages,
I state a conviction that's flat:
A person's most difficult age is
Whichever he's presently at!

Anonymous

You're a child when you think that when you grow up you'll discover some secret and you're grown up when you realize there is no such secret.

Alfred Adler

I used to wish for loud applause
and offices to tell me what I was;
I used to dream of senate seats
and long for power to make right.

Having no father of my own
I borrowed you for teacher:
me in the present is the real.

Oh I was sad and lonely then
and wrongly wanted magic fame
to fill me up with love.

So guide me still
that I can own
a lonely feeling
as my own.

Eliot Glassheim, "Poem for
Goodman Dead," August 1972

The period of writing this thesis rather than the actual writing itself posed more personal problems, both real and phantasized, than the writer would either care to enunciate or could have foreseen at the outset of this undertaking. Haunted by Goodmanesque obsessions pertaining to the programming of life-styles and the packaging of existence at every level of human activity within this baffling and ineffectual world of ours, the writer found living with himself—let alone his thoughts, fears and hopes—was often more than he could singly bear. The period of writing, then, resembled the rite of passage of initiation of a young aboriginal (of yore) to a position of manhood in his tribe. There were the preliminary ordeals of torture, the gnashing of teeth, the slashing and searing of flesh, the cries and wails, the fear of failure coupled with the ecstasy of achievement, the sorrow for times past or lost forever, and the final deliverance of the man and his shallow accomplishments before his academic peers. No longer is this man to be psychically shadowed or shackled by the intellectual presence of his elders. Rather, he walks deftly in the spiritual company of nothing or none save his private, fledgling thoughts, humble hopes, and secret apprehensions.

Now that these tentative treads are underfoot, the writer is hopeful that his recollection of Goodman's dignified academic bearing and unique insights concerning life and life's endeavours, will provide him the fortitude to rise above personal despair—a feeling which threatens to engulf his entire person and overtake his spirit. We are temporary prisoners (more's the pity!) of our world, for whichever commune we flee to, or in whatsoever corner of the environment we rest our heads, or from whichever suffocating and suppressive dominant structure we disaffiliate ourselves, there is no eluding the political and psychological checks of the existing social order. Unfortunately, all of us cannot escape this present world even if we try. Perhaps we should not try at all, because psychic imprisonment and consternation—products of the ensuing conflicts which occur when man familiarizes or acquaints himself with his historical environment—are learning experiences we should treasure; in fact, ones by which man learns through testing and immersion in life's events and affairs, rather than by way of insulation in schools. Therefore the only alternatives freely available to us, and hence the only expedients with which we can proceed, improve upon and alter in the future, are, for better or worse, those we presently possess (thus our dilemma!).

Chapter I

THE LONELINESS OF THE LONG-DISTANCE AGITATOR:

PAUL GOODMAN, RADICAL EDUCATOR[1]

I was no happier when I was young, and I wrote poems; it is no bed of roses when I am toothless and have failing eyes, and I write poems. I never was a beauty, to get what I wanted sexually, but now I am also too tired to seek for it. But even worse than my private trouble is how men have made of the earth an object of disgust, and the stupidity and pettiness of statesmen tormenting mankind and putting additional obstacles in the way, as if life were not hard enough. It does not help, either, that people are so pathetic, the apparently powerful as much as the powerless. To pity is another drain of spirit. But it helps me to say it just as it is, however it is.

Paul Goodman, *Speaking and Language* (1971)

And I remember Shelley's

"Make me thy lyre, even as the forest is!"
Something is breathing me despite myself.

Paul Goodman, *Commencement* (1962)

I am doggy, dogged, and doglike. But I am not a dog, a dirty dog, or a gay dog.

Paul Goodman, *Five Years*

In *The Empire City*, Horatio says the best thing of all is to fight a long, drawn-out losing fight. It's not optimism. It's what you do in the absence of proof, but under the pressure of deeply moving experience.

George Dennison

Today, Goodman matters.

George Steiner

The name Paul Goodman conjures up many and various images and associations to different people. There was Goodman the acerbic social critic and famous for *Growing Up Absurd* (1960)[2] and *People or Personnel* (1965); and Goodman the non-resident philosopher and agitator of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement. There was also Goodman the father figure for academic dropouts (and in the sixties the New Left), a leading participant in peace demonstrations, a guiding light behind "radical" Free University schemes, and an acknowledged proponent of anarchic-style existence. This was the same Goodman who wrote moralistic pamphlets and epistles on polemical issues to public figures in major newspapers. To this Goodman, that venerable old darling of the Democrats, Adlai Stevenson, prior to his death, addressed a major letter on foreign policy. (The letter, although never sent, was published posthumously.)

The American Place Theatre in New York presented Goodman's play *Jonah* in February, 1966. (Despite its panning by the critics, the play only served to cement the relationships between Goodman and his coterie of followers.) Verse by Goodman was collected as the *Lordly Hudson* (1962) and *Hawkweed* (1967). Perhaps we should not forget to introduce the novelist Paul Goodman, author of the tetralogy *The Empire City* (1959) and *Making Do* (1963), who is related to Goodman the short story writer —*Our Visit to Niagara* (1960) and *The Break-up of Our Camp* (1949). Maybe both of these individuals are connected with Goodman the literary critic, who wrote *The Structure of Literature* (1954) and *Kafke's Prayer* (1947), and close to the perceptive individual of the same name who was once a television critic for *The New Republic* not so long ago. All of these men compete for the honour of being "Paul Goodman, Ph.D.," co-author of an enormous treatise, *Gestalt Therapy* (1951), the distinguished Man of Letters (a title he prized), or Paul Goodman, co-author (with brother Percival) of *Communitas* (1947), a classic study of city planning.

There was, and could only ever be, one Paul Goodman, and he has been variously described as poet, psychotherapist, anarchist, teacher, and propounder of imaginative solutions to mundane problems. Despite the fact that he possessed a tendency to "spread himself thinly" (as he himself put it), this tendency often showed up his "weaknesses" as strengths. These strengths emanated from the same Paul Goodman born in New York City in 1911, at one time a resident of its lower West side, and in later years alternating his place of residence by spending half the year in his "native" city and the other half in the woody areas of New Hampshire. A man of many highly developed interests, Goodman afforded himself only two distinct personalities:

> First, I'm a humanist. Everything I do has exactly the same subject—the organism and the environment. Anything I write on society is pragmatic—it aims to accomplish something. I don't write on psychiatry; that book's on therapy. That universities should divide my interests into different fields doesn't make them separate in fact. Apart from that, I'm also an artist. That's a different internal spring. You don't create an artwork from the same motivation. I write songs, for instance, but that's the same as writing a poem. Also, it's impossible to be a dramatist without being a musician or a choreographer. I'm a man of letters . . . or an artist-humanist.[3]

It is extremely interesting to speculate how Paul Goodman became "Paul Goodman." Shortly after he was born, his father suffered a setback in business and deserted the family. Goodman's mother then moved her three children from Washington Square to a slum area near Mount Sinai Hospital in New York. Since his mother worked as a saleswoman, his sister was employed, and his older brother Percival (now a famous architect) had left home, Goodman was a "latchkey boy"—someone who let himself into his own house. Shrugging off the popular mythology that the absence of a father had its disadvantages, Goodman felt that it had some advantages:

> It means more freedom for the kid to discover himself and the removal of a certain competitiveness. Remember, a good father can be difficult for a kid; he has nothing to revolt against. On the other hand, a fatherless kid is likely to be poor, also to be lonely; his house is nearly always empty. The real meaning of being fatherless, however, is that you have no one to show you the basic ropes through life, such as, in my case, of applying for a scholarship to college or graduate school.[4]

Though accustomed to the hardships and denials accompanying his family's state of poverty, Goodman's education did not suffer by comparison. He was thoroughly grounded in religious ideas—and to the end of his days possessed a strong interest in theology. Goodman also spent some time at the prestigious, now-defunct Townsend Harris, a pressure-cooker style high school near the City College (N.Y.) campus, which had a profound reputation for toughness. Of the 300 accepted at entrance, less than one-quarter were to graduate three years later. Goodman, a "great test-athlete" as he jokingly parodied himself, graduated with the highest marks in his class of 1927. Indicating trends to come, the yearbook lists a collection of honours and prizes. A classmate remembers: "Those *bona fide* geniuses like Goodman and Konrad Gries (now Professor of Classical Languages at Queen's College) loused it up for all the normal geniuses, because they got such high scores on exams."[5]

Leaving Townsend Harris, Goodman went to City College, and earned a straight "A" average, except for a D in public speaking (he was later to master the art). Neglecting to apply for a graduate fellowship, he had no other choice but to seek a job. All that was around in 1931 was "outside reading" at $10 a week for M.G.M., where Alice, his older sister with whom he was living, had a full-time job.[6]

One day Goodman decided to bicycle to Columbia University. Although he was too poor to formally register as a student, he sat in on Richard McKeon's philosophy lectures. Quite soon, however, the professor, recognizing his genius, informally accepted him as a class member and invited him to submit papers—one of these, "Neo-Classicism, Platonism and Romanticism," being published in the *Journal of Philosophy*.[7] Now and again Goodman would take the boat to Fall River, Massachusetts (for the $1.70 round trip), then hitchhike to Cambridge to attend Irving Babbit's lectures at Harvard. This helped prove a point Goodman often insisted: "Anybody who really wants an education can always get one. Just go in and sit down." He also admired the attitude of his great professor, the philosopher Morris Cohen[8] who, faced by a class three times the number officially registered, shrugged and said, "Well, I'm not a constable." In 1935, McKeon, now a dean at the University of Chicago, invited Goodman to lecture on English literature. By 1940 Goodman had completed his Ph.D. thesis. In what was soon to become a familiar incident, he was fired from the staff—for "non-conformist sexual behavior"—and consequently did not officially receive his degree until 1954 (partly because he was too needy to present his research in the correct form), when the University of Chicago Press published the thesis as *The Structure of Literature*.

Goodman's official career since that time was sporadic at best. Twice more he was given teaching appointments—at Manumit, a progressive school in New York where he taught Greek, physics, history and mathematics; and at the experimental Black Mountain College in North Carolina —only hastening his departure by indulging in sexual "irregularities." In the early fifties, he was to convert an informal habit of aiding people who visited him into a thriving practice and became a lay psychotherapist. His credentials for the job were two years of therapy under the guidance of his college classmate, Alexander Lowen, author of *Love and Orgasm* (1965), and three years of group therapy in a circle of psychiatrists. Although unlicenced, Goodman had gained admittance into the company of his psychiatric peers and patients, that authority to his way of thinking, being sufficient. Over twenty hours of therapy a week raised his family's income to $100 or so a week, although many of his patients were treated gratis. By 1958, however, he found himself overworked and too unhappy to keep regular contact with his patients.

Most of Goodman's adult life was consumed in writing—a trade which only rarely in the beginning brought him monetary support. In the early thirties, Goodman wrote about one hundred short stories. Being too poor to purchase stamps, he cycled to town transporting his manuscripts from one magazine to another. At first, none were published; but by the late thirties, Goodman had become a regular contributor to *Partisan Review*, primarily as a film editor, perhaps capitalizing on a career which was beginning to emerge in its embryonic stages as intellectually brilliant, but not particularly radical.

Goodman's situation of poverty outlasted the Depression and beyond his acquisition of a family. Until 1953, Goodman once explained, his family lived in the lowest tenth income bracket like "Southern sharecroppers"—at $1500 to $2000 a year. In the forties, anarchist publications, such as *Resistance* and *Why?* and *Politics* paid their contributors precious little or nothing at all, while *The New Republic* at least offered modest sums, as did the *Kenyon Review*. Goodman's first books appeared in 1942 when he published *Stop Light*, a group of five dance poems, and *The Grand Piano*, a novel.[9] In 1948, however, Goodman could still boast of possessing a trunkful of unpublished manuscripts, and what he considered his best single book, the novel *The Dead Spring* (later incorporated into *The Empire City*), was published privately in 1950 by soliciting funds from a small circle of friends.

By 1959, at the nadir of his adult life, his poetry was riddled with self-pity:

> What I will I can't
> and what I wish I mayn't
> what I ought I won't
> and what I must I don't.
> . . . .
> Heavy silence has grown
> around me like a wall
> and I feel early
> shut in my narrow room. . . .[10]

Paul Goodman's world seemed to be falling apart: his marriage appeared to be disintegrating, his daughter Susan was ill with polio, and publishers were rejecting his work as if he was blacklisted. Perhaps the best source for witnessing his despairs of this period is his *Five Years: Thoughts During a Useless Time*—an unashamedly honest, moving memoir, published in 1966. "I am continually tormented by not being published," Goodman wrote in his notebooks which make up the volume. "I am constantly nagged by my original sin: to be a Virgil and manufacture a meaning for this Empire. But instead I come on like a Cicero who never had his day."[11] During this fairly long eclipse in his career, Goodman's work was known only by a small coterie of passionate admirers.

Undoubtedly, the turning point in Goodman's career—from poor man to rich one, from scorned outsider to respected thinker—was the publication of *Growing Up Absurd* in 1960. Ironically, the book was rejected by the publisher who originally commissioned it; when *Commentary* ran chapters of it, Random House purchased it. Since its publication it has been fairly well acclaimed, becoming the main book by which American youth between fifteen and twenty-five identify their personal dilemmas. Many academics who grew up in the sixties still recall how helpful it was—articulating the ill-formed notions of a youthful generation which could make little sense out of its own existence.

Since the successes of *Growing Up Absurd*, Goodman had one or more books published a year (publishing five books in 1962), and nearly everything he experienced eventually found its way into print.[12] A more lucrative concern for him were public lectures, for which he received "anything from nothing to $1000." His schedule in the sixties was the nightmarish and endless round of lectures, readings (poetry), symposiums, conferences, television interviews, and rehearsals of his plays. He acquired the skill of writing on airplanes—something that did not bother him in the least. During the middle sixties he conducted a seminar at the Institute for Policy studies in Washington once every three weeks. Then in the spring of 1964, he was made Knapp Distinguished Scholar (in Urban Affairs) at the University of Wisconsin in Milwaukee; the following spring, he became the first to occupy a new chair at San

Francisco State College, where students had the opportunity to hire a teacher of their choice each term, without interference by administrators.[13]

Suddenly finding himself the centre of attention did not affect Goodman, possibly because he had been so poor and so neglected for so long. In 1962, with a self-effacement rare in public personalities, he wrote: "Lately, I have been too exhausted to invent new speeches, and I repeat myself, sick of the sound of my voice."[14] Although "middle-aged" by anyone's standards, commentators would still describe Goodman in his late forties as medium of height, slight of build, and looking at least a dozen years younger than he actually was. Nevertheless, there was an air of the melancholy about him, although he was remarkably cool and calm for a man so active and productive. Whether engrossed in conversation with friends or being interviewed on television he spoke easily and engagingly, perhaps pausing occasionally to fill his pipe and light it. His graying hair was matted and unruly; his attire usually as informal as his language and manners. As Goodman divulges in *Five Years*: "[My] unkemptness is not carelessness, but not bothering to dress up; my vice is that I am not happy and interested enough in the ordinary occasions of life to dress up for them."[15]

Within the city, Goodman's chief recreation was to go out most Saturdays and play handball with a bunch of children on East First Street. Even though his income now fell in the highest tenth, he lived modestly, but comfortably. He and his wife, Sally, and their young daughter, Daisy Jane, resided through the middle sixties in a modest Upper West Side apartment with few "prized necessities," despite the fact that Goodman could really afford to live otherwise. Their only son, Matthew, was killed in a fall while mountain climbing in 1967. A 1953 Chevy sat parked on the street outside, and the family then had a small farm in North Stratford, New Hampshire, near the Canadian border.

In contrast to nearly all the intellectuals of his generation who have taken various political positions according to the directions in which their personal and intellectual whims moved them, Goodman always remained a "community anarchist" ever since he read Kropotkin as an undergraduate. These anarchist tendencies, which were pragmatic and reformist, continued to infuse all of his writings. Though a staunch anarchist he had always been anti-Communist, and American Communists have never embraced Goodman or his ideas. Not once during his career was he accused of pious anti-Americanism, referring jokingly to himself as an "anarchist patriot,"[16] and at other times pointing to the beauty of our "libertarian, pluralist, and populist experiment."[17]

A common theme of Goodman's writings is that man is essentially creative, loving, and communal; but organized bureaucracies suppress his natural humanity, making it necessary for him to conform to their functioning, rather than to his own.[18] In addition, when these organisations achieve more power than the individuals who serve them, man loses contact with his natural self to suit the aggrandizing needs of a monopolistic, impersonal system.[19] Being an anarchist, Goodman wants to strip order and organisation to a bare minimum rather than increase it. Therefore he rejects the style of life that is too institutionalized and pleads for the scaling down of social functions into human proportions—workable communities geared to the needs of man.[20] This important anarchist strain[21] in Goodman has permeated his life's activities and writings: that human beings are "innocent," and that organized bureaucracies create "evil."

In his spate of books encompassing a diversity of subjects, Goodman has moved from a critique of the Organised System—how society corrupts its people—to the perhaps predictable next step of offering solutions. *Growing Up Absurd* deals with the important problem of growing up in America: why the young drop out of school and society, why some of them become delinquents, why they cannot make up their minds about a career, and why they seem to be disinterested in so much. Adopting the stance of an apologist for youth, Goodman believes that the environment man creates through his own endeavours is hostile to human progress.[22] It fails to provide sufficient alternatives for human tasks and pays scant attention to people's psychosocial needs:

> Our abundant society is at present simply deficient in many of the most elementary objective opportunities and worthwhile goals that could make growing up possible. It is lacking in enough man's work . . . in honest public speech . . . in the opportunity to be useful. It thwarts aptitude and creates stupidity. It corrupts ingenuous patriotism. It corrupts the fine arts. It shackles science. It dampens animal ardour. It discourages the religious convictions of Justification and Vocation. It dims the sense that there is a Creation. It has no Honour. It has no Community.[23]

To explain the malfunctioning environment more vividly, Goodman advances the metaphor of a rat race—people locked in combat or competition in an "apparently closed room" with little hope of escape and no value other than self-preservation. "Absurdity" in this respect refers to the discrepancy between goals and performance—the awareness on the part of the young that society exists for its own, meaningless, self-aggrandizing sake, devoid of human purpose:

> In a milieu of resignation, where the young men think of society as a closed room in which there are no values but the rejected rat race or what they can produce out of their own guts, it is extremely hard to aim at objective truth or world culture. One's own products are likely to be personal and parochial.[24]

Confident that he at least had the support of disenchanted youth, Goodman exhorted them to take action: "One has the persistent thought that if 10,000 people in all walks of life will stand up on their two feet, and talk out and insist, we shall get back our country."[25] Perhaps the reason why the young worshipped *Growing Up Absurd* so much was that it underscored the anomalies of a society they felt within their bones but could not clearly articulate.

Goodman's world is one where purpose and effect, goals and performance, are married. It is a unified vision, unmistakably Utopian, of a possible America, where

> A premium is placed on technical improvement and on the engineering style of functional simplicity and clarity. Where workers are technically educated and have a say in management. Where no one drops out of society and there is mobility between classes. Where the community is planned as a whole with an organic integration of work, living, and play. Where production is primarily for use. Where it is the policy to give an adequate voice to the unusual and unpopular opinion and to give a trial and a market to new enterprise. Where sexuality is taken for granted. And where education is concerned with fostering human powers as they develop in the growing child.[26]

Throughout his life, Goodman has confronted us with a number of imaginative alternatives, which, if brought to realization, will move us closer to his ideal. Few Utopian thinkers have formulated such specific and general proposals.[27] In *Communitas*, putting to use that common sense which made him famous, Goodman and his brother (who co-authored the book), challenged the prevalent assumption that the quality of human existence is an accident of chaotic urban life. With text and drawings they showed the feasibility of planning for, and implementing, drastic changes to make metropolitan areas once again suitable environments for good human living.

Goodman also proposed dividing the economy into two sectors—subsistence and luxury. Years before Richard Nixon and others recommended a guaranteed minimum income for all American citizens, Goodman suggested that essentials for personal living—such as food, clothing, shelter, medical attention, and transportation—should be provided free of charge. In exchange, the state would require each citizen to devote six years only of his working life to producing subsistence commodities. When this service was completed, individuals could do what they pleased. On the other hand, if a person wished luxuries—wealth, power, extensive travel, or "extra" items—he would be free to work in the luxury section unhindered by government control. Here he could earn a different kind of money to purchase an abundant supply of subsistence goods and services. However, if a person contented himself with minimum subsistence, he would be free not to do extra work at all. Such a two-pronged economy, Goodman argued, had the advantage of continually providing everyone with essentials without requiring the production and consumption of inessential commodities.

In his two books on education, *The Community of Scholars* (1964) and *Compulsory Mis-Education* (1964), Goodman favours disestablishing compulsory schooling[28] for a system involving various alternative kinds of educational arrangements[29] (e.g. the city as school, farm schools, practical apprenticeships, guided travel, work camps, little theatres, local newspapers, and community service) which provide children with opportunities to choose the kind that suits their desires (or, if they wish, no school at all).[30] "Fundamentally," Goodman has observed, "there is no right education except growing up into a worthwhile world. Indeed, our excessive concern with problems of education at present simply means that the grown-ups do not have such a world."[31]

Remaining true to this definition, Goodman also proposes taking students out of the academic high schools and giving them time to develop their own personal interests. As a prerequisite to entering college, he would even require students preparing for university in the liberal arts to spend two years outside of school. Disregarding the direction of former educational debates concerning what is to be learned in educational institutions, Goodman espouses an education rich in both classical knowledge and contemporary experience and know-how. At the university level, he urges the larger institutions to allow themselves to "fall apart" into smaller units, each with a student body of about 450 and a staff of approximately 50.

One of Goodman's more recent efforts, *People or Personnel* (1965) is a plea for decentralization in our societies. Although he is willing to concede that certain functions of society should be centrally run, e.g. the water supply or the telephone system, Goodman finds nothing to justify radio networks, motor-car combines, chains of supermarkets, or any other enterprises "tightly involved with the performance and even more with the style of the dominant system of society."[32] Not only do they inflate the prices of cheap goods and services, they also transform people who comprise them into personnel-mindless robots engaged in a process over which they have little control and are disinterested. Only by a systematic decentralization of overorganized systems can the human functions of society achieve any meaning and heightened sense of purpose.

Despite his often heavy-handed and technically uneven prose style, Goodman possessed a didactic mind which was imaginative, keen and insightful, schematic, and moralistic, before it was profound, skeptical, analytical, or empirical.[33] His particular forte was applying his anarchist sentiments and ideas to all kinds of pressing problems to produce highly unconventional, appealing solutions.[34] In his books such original proposals as the following can easily be found:[35]

(1) Banning private automobiles from Manhattan and converting many streets into pedestrial malls;

(2) Using state money to encourage migration to the countryside in an endeavour to increase the rural population of the United States to 20 percent;

(3) Building dormitories in housing projects to allow children to safely get away from home;

(4) Creating apprenticeship programmes as social enterprises for school dropouts (and then allowing academic re-entry into the educational system at will);

(5) Encouraging children to observe their parents while love-making;

(6) Instituting psychotherapy in high schools and as a mandatory course for the senior year at college;

(7) Replacing physical education with "eurhythmics" (bodily movements to rhythmic accompaniment) to unblock emotions through muscular release;

(8) Recommending that farmers be given $5000 a year to look after mentally-disturbed people ("harmless loonies");

(9) Decentralizing the policing of delinquents to people in their own neighbourhoods.

Seeking to implement his Utopian proposals, Goodman became an intellectual shooter-from-the-hip: an action man who propagated his ideas by contributing to a wide variety of periodicals an endless array of essays and reviews (many repeating or elaborating themes from his books), writing letters to major public firms and eminent Americans and then publishing them wherever possible (some of these were collected in *The Society I Live in is Mine* in 1962), lecturing everywhere under all kinds of auspices, appearing on radio and television, participating in public symposiums, accepting appointments such as membership on the local school board in his native Manhattan; and then openly supporting a political candidate whom he favoured, such as John Lindsay.[36]

Rarely has Goodman compromised his attitudes to suit either his audience or the occasion; and more than once he has courageously offended his sponsors and supporters. "One advantage of being a 'success,'" said Goodman, "is that I can now say my say without being accused of sour grapes."[37] The most vivid picture of Goodman in this regard is one described in his own message to the National Security Industrial Association in November, 1967; while 30 students picketed and leafletted the auditorium on the outside, Goodman read the riot act to the militarists and industrialists on the inside:

> You people are unfitted by your commitments, your experience, your customary methods, your recruitment, and your moral disposition. You are the military-industrial of the United States, the most dangerous body of men at present in the world, for you not only implement our disastrous policies, but are an overwhelming lobby for them, and you expand and rigidify the wrong use of brains, resources, and labour so that change becomes difficult. . . . (The) best service you people could perform is rather rapidly to phase yourselves out . . .[38]

More recently, in *New Reformation: Notes of a Neolithic Conservative* (1970) and particularly in his book of verse, *Homespun of Oatmeal Gray* (1970), Goodman has made severe remarks about the intellectual disorientation of student rebels:

> I can't rest and listen to the hatred
> of these young voices, I stalk off alone
> my spirit sinking.
> . . . .
> During my long lifetime
> by and large what I have blabbed arousing resistance
> recklessly has proved to be what I intend.
> . . . .
> But these grown up in a world too meaningless to
>   learn much
> now are quick to resent that they know very little.[39]

Needless to say, the criticisms included in both of these works produced a backlash of *ad hominem* criticism from some of his former or most likely supporters.

Goodman's outspoken and peremptory manner did not shield him from attempts at cooptation by the very organizations he despised and hoped to destroy.[40] Years ago he exposed in print the C.I.A.'s backing of journals to which he had contributed or which had favourably appraised his books.[41] He once wrote in *Dissent*:

> *Esquire* magazine has used me as an instrument, a kind of jester to manufacture conversation-pieces, while I was nevertheless expressing my "free" ideas and decisions and hoping that a few of the many hundred readers would take them seriously.[42]

Overall, however, Goodman's twofold willingness to take personal risks and give his time and energy so effortlessly was one of the reasons why his books are not as excellent or as telling in their impact as perhaps they could be (the prose is occasionally impenetrable) and yet also why he was so tremendously influential and revered among his radical peers.

One commentator from Berkeley has reported that the only writer who was quoted "consistently" by the Free Speech Movement was Paul Goodman. Laughingly calling himself "the Joan of Arc of the free student movement," Goodman has said, "I'm invited to be on the staff of every free university in the land. I wish I could; but I don't have the time."[43] The Berkeley Free Speech Movement frequently cited Goodman's statement:

> At present in the United States, students—(middle class youth)—are the major exploited class. The labour of intelligent youth is needed and they are accordingly subjected to tight scheduling, speed-up and other factory methods.[44]

In countless articles Goodman elaborated on this theme by attacking colleges as bureaucratic machines that had proved unable to provide youth with genuine learning opportunities: the education of youth had become more exploitation—a dampening of their natural enthusiasm and capacities and time for worthless purposes.

To explain not only his identification with the "oppressed" condition of youth,[45] but also his impact on them, Goodman explained: "I love kids, I really do. I listen to them. I don't want to impose my ideas on them, for I'm sure the ideas they have will be ideas I've never thought of. I want to teach, but I don't want to lead."[46] Goodman believed, until shortly before his death, that the youth, beside giving his ideas a sympathetic hearing, found the relevance of his classical learning to present day existence quite appealing: "They suffer from no bridge to the great cultures of the past. . . . I'm able to show how you can relate Aristotle to the correct position on Vietnam."[47] Today, however, primarily because Goodman soured in his relationships with the young and despised their anti-intellectuality, he is admired as a prophet and exemplar (compared to Alan Ginsberg) of an unfettered life in a bureaucratic society.

Goodman was a willing picketer and spokesman at everything from anti-Vietnam War rallies to the General Strike for Peace (perhaps his strongest political passion). This was not a new experience for Goodman. During World War II he recalled:

> I was having a disagreement with the Selective Service and was set to go to jail, though this was entirely against both my prudent principles and my wishes. My philosophical and political position was Dodging. Fortunately, the United States and I came to an accommodation.[48]

The Vietnam situation, Goodman believed, was immoral, unjust and disadvantageous to all Americans. He once said, "We should get the hell out, period." In the summer of 1965, he joined with a group of intellectuals in personally asking Adlai Stevenson to resign as a protest over American foreign policy. Goodman also served as an associate editor of *Liberation* magazine, culling an anthology from its pages entitled *Seeds of Liberation* (1966) and contributing poems and a foreword; and all through 1966 he was particularly active, being strongly in demand by pacifist groups.

This intense public activity never allowed Goodman the privilege of neglecting his other artistic self. In 1963, he published another novel, *Making Do*, which reviewers proclaimed as almost autobiographical. Most of his later poems have been collected in *Hawkweed* (1967), and Goodman produced scripts for new plays shortly before he died. His thirst for playwriting dates as far back as 1940, and when The Living Theatre was formed, Goodman became, as he himself put it, "a kind of company psychiatrist," filling his idle moments by writing plays for the stage. An early, extravagant venture of The Living Theatre was Goodman's cruelly reviewed production, in the summer of 1959, of his play *The Cave at Machpelah*.[49] Despite this significant flop, Goodman has been placed in the forefront of the vanguard of American playwrights, and was one of the first to introduce both poetic and non-linguistic statements—sounds, screams, movements, and the like—to the ears of American audiences. As a token of gratitude to his followers, Goodman frequently insisted in writing that such respected non-community organizations as The Living Theatre be funded from money collected by taxing the commercial theatre and the mass media.[50]

Although Goodman will never find himself grouped beside some of America's most imaginative writers—particularly in those polls which count—his creative endeavours have earned him admirable reviews, numerous plaudits, and a vociferous following. His impressively-conceived tetralogy *The Empire City* (in which Goodman attempted to do for New York what Joyce did for Dublin) is good fiction, if we are to accept the opinions of its reviewers (the book drew unanimous superlatives and minor criticisms). The *New York Herald Tribune Book Review* described the work as "not so much written as whistled, laughed, teased, prayed" and "as close to imparting a man's gratuitous love for his own kind as mere language ever can."[51] However, a few reviewers referred to the novel as ill-written and uneven, sloppy, lumpy, and intolerably self-indulgent. In the *Lordly Hudson* (1962), Goodman's first collection of poetry, he employs traditional formats in a loose, winning manner (here he pays homage to his Aristotelian education) to write about personal observations and experiences, in language resembling heightened speech. Perhaps his most memorable lines are those concluding the title lyric:

> This is our Lordly Hudson, hardly flowing
> under the green-grown cliffs
> and has no peer in Europe or the East.
> Be quiet, heart! Home! Home![52]

Resembling his fiction, the poetry Goodman wrote was extremely personal, concerned with his city, his family, his friends, and his experiences.

Both Goodman's art and his politics cannot be separated from his views on sex. Espousing Wilhelm Reich's position that bodily appetites liberally satisfied determine mental health, Goodman attacked the Freudian position which posits the opposite causality.[53] His understanding of St. Thomas' view on sex led him to suggest, in truly "John and Mary" fashion (remembering the film of the same name), that lovemaking precedes understanding, love, and esteem in personal relationships. He also thought that society's rules and attitudes towards sexuality were outmoded and irrelevant. This led him to openly and vehemently advocate that the state should not interfere in a person's sexual life ("to license sex is absurd").

Although he lived with his wife Sally, a robust, quiet, attractive woman, for over 23 years and they had raised two children, they never legally married. Loyal and monogamous at home, he cultivated boy friends and girl friends on the outside, having as he himself put it, "been bisexual since the age of 12." Recounting his many and various sexual advantures in *Five Years*, Goodman candidly admitted he prowled openly for sex, assuming the appearance of an earnest, pipe-smoking Socrates of the bars, docks, and playgrounds of Manhattan, and the streets and cafes of Europe. As it turned out, trying to keep everybody happy—whether a boy friend, girl friend, or wife, let alone himself—was an almost impossible feat:[54]

> My sexual behaviour, void of both lust and satisfaction, may now be fairly and strictly equated to a false cultus—religion, an obsession. My seeking and waiting are its pieties and austerities; and the sexual act itself has just about the meaning of a ritual sacrifice, and is about as delicious as a communion wafer. This is a false religion, an idolatry. The question—and I must soon seek the answer or founder—is, what am I obsessionally warding off?[55]

Goodman's radical career and thought have been subjected to unending criticism and personal scrutiny and perhaps some of this is justified. Because of a tendency to display in more personal encounters, on the one hand, flashes of intellectual snobbery and personal pretension which overruled his espoused egalitarianism, and on the other, an unwillingness to accept or see opposing viewpoints which damaged his reputation for human concern, Goodman repelled many people who might otherwise have honoured his presence. As a writer, and particularly polemicist, Goodman came across to his public as unforgivably pompous: "The society I live in is mine, open to my voice and action, or I do not live there at all."[56] Moreover, his unabashed homosexuality was perhaps too aggressive for even so-called enlightened circles, and for this reason he was repeatedly shunned. In a poem, "Little Prayers," Goodman bemoans:

> At last I know—for friends have said—
> my shameless public ways have made
> me scorned and frail and lonely in
> this teeming city.[57]

Many critics perhaps vaguely and unfairly have labelled Goodman's thought as too Utopian to be of any use. Others have attacked Goodman for disregarding the achievements of modern technological society (although Goodman was no Luddite); and even those who were attuned to Goodman's critical purposes suggest that he did not recognize the need for bureaucracies in a modern society of over 200 million people. Specialists in colleges and universities have often said that Goodman spread himself too thinly; he was an intellectual Jack-of-all-trades—a man for all seasons, but a master of none. Perhaps the most serious charge by intellectuals is that Goodman consistently refused to allow for failure or deficiencies in human intelligence: "I have a democratic faith—it's a religion with me—that everybody is really able to take care of himself, to get on with people, and to make a good society. If it's not so, I don't want to hear of it."[58]

To be completely fair to Goodman, however, he never did claim professional expertise, but only the application of his unique and keen sensibility to various areas of human endeavour. George Dennison, for many years a close friend and associate of Goodman who was trained by him in psychotherapy, narrates the nature of these extraordinary powers, which Goodman wielded with his endless array of thoughts, ideas and actions, in the following manner:

> Goodman was one of the first to identify (and analyse) the underlying illnesses of American life. He helped create the self-conscious desire for change; and then was more gifted than anyone in expressing the needs that many people felt, and in proposing both long-range and specific, immediate changes.[59]

Goodman wore many masks and cloaks in his life, but none was more significant than his role of father-figure to the vanguard—the young, representative minority. "Most of my intellectual generation sold out," Goodman surmised, "first to the Communists and then to the organized system, so that there are very few independents around that a young man can accept as a hero. The next generation must have fathers more ideal than their own."[60] Goodman's personal integrity impressed the young (and often disturbed the elderly) because he was a man who lived through his ideals, defying bureaucratic systems he associated with, outwardly practicing the sexual libertarianism he preached, preventing editors to bowdlerize what he wrote, and mastering his hold over poverty to such an extent that he could never succumb to money, and was resistant to flattery.[61]

This is the Goodman the world will never forget: a man who was a personal, living example to his ideas. Above all there is Goodman the modest Man of Letters, a humanist whose works will endure for decades, perhaps always. Then there is the artist whose ideas will never die, just conspicuously fade away. There is also Goodman (in comparison to his contemporary Alan Ginsberg) the dauntless, tireless prophet of a New Age—a man who shouted "Naked!" when he saw an emperor with no clothes. And finally, there is Goodman the tragic anti-hero, who provides us with the exhilarating spectre of a gallant knight doggedly jousting with windmills which have turned out to be Philistine giants.[62] So wretched a creature is this noble protagonist that he is frequently plagued by the loneliness of a long distance runner who is destined for nowhere yet everywhere.

In a recently published article, Goodman required only "that the children have bright eyes, the river be clean, food and sex be available, and nobody be pushed around" and, for himself, "that I can live on a little."[63] Unfortunately, the latter request was not granted. During 1971 he suffered two heart attacks, yet refused to take seriously his doctor's warning that he should stay in hospital. Prior to his death on August 6, 1972, at age 61, Goodman religiously followed a daily schedule of gardening on his North Stratford, New Hampshire farm, perhaps now and again visiting friends and (predictably) writing—another collection of poems, and a book on religion. "He wasn't a man to follow prescriptions," his doctor recounted. "He had too much to do."[64] Had Goodman been presented the opportunity of governing his own passing, he would not have wished it any other way.

Footnotes to Chapter I

[1] The writer must apologize somewhat in this biography of Goodman's intellectual development for perhaps momentarily diverting the reader from the (later) main concern of this thesis: i.e., the application of what the writer construes as Goodman's human nature conception to Goodman's thoughts and ideas, particularly those related to education. Unfortunately, such a predicament could not have been avoided. This is because any personal or biographical data concerning Goodman presently in existence (at least as far as the writer is aware) give no hint or indication from where his human nature conception sprang, or reinforce the writer's personal interpretation in this thesis. The writer's sneaking suspicions regarding this point have been confirmed in correspondence exchanged with other Goodmanites throughout the United States (see Appendix II). However, despite the fact that this biography of Goodman sheds little light on Goodman's human nature conception (apart from the first quotation cited indicating Goodman's interest in the subject of individual-environment interaction, and the knowledge that Goodman practised psychotherapy in the 1940's and 1950's) that reason is not sufficient, at least in the writer's opinion, for excluding it from the study entirely. Perhaps more comforting, especially from the reader's standpoint, is the writer's avowed promise to take up his human nature interpretation in succeeding sections of the study. (A slightly condensed, more modified version of this biography of Goodman is to appear in *The Australian Journal of Higher Education* late in 1973.)

[2] The majority of Goodman's books referred to in this biography are to be found in Eliot Glassheim's "Paul Goodman: A Checklist, 1931-1971," *Bulletin of Bibliography and Magazine Notes*, Vol. 29, No. 2, April-June 1972, pp. 61-72. For this reason, the writer has decided to avoid the harrowing process of citing publishers, and date and place of publications, in footnotes at the end of this chapter, as Goodman's books are mentioned in the main text. Rather, the writer simply refers the reader to Appendix I (particularly items 1-34), the source for which was provided above.

[3] B. Harte and C. Reley, (eds), *200 Contemporary Authors*, New York: Gale Press, 1969, p. 132 (see Appendix I, item 693).

[4] *Time*, August 14, 1972, p. 35 (see Appendix II).

[5] R. Kostelanetz, "The Prevalence of Paul Goodman," *New York Times Magazine*, April 3, 1966, p. 70ff (see Appendix I, item 695).

[6] This phase of Goodman's life is vividly recounted in Delmore Schwartz's *The World is a Wedding*, Norfolk, Connecticut: New Direction Press, 1948 (see Appendix II).

[7] P. Goodman, "Neo-Classicism, Platonism and Romanticism," *Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 31, No. 6, March 15, 1934, pp. 148-163 (see Appendix I, item 82).

[8] As far as the writer can ascertain from scholars in the field, Morris Cohen was a philosopher of logical analysis who taught his students (including Goodman) to challenge accepted dogmas in order to think critically and responsibly.

[9] C. Moritz, (ed), *Current Biography: Yearbook 1968*, New York: H.W. Wilson and Co., 1968, pp. 155-156 (see Appendix II).

[10] P. Goodman, "A Visit to Chartres," *Kenyon Review*, Vol. 21, No. 4, Autumn 1959, p. 572 (see Appendix I, item 75).

[11] Moritz, *Current Biography*, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

[12] *Time*, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

[13] A. Daniels, *Academics of the Line*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1970, p. 26.

[14] J. Ellerby, "The World of Paul Goodman," *Anarchy*, January 1962, p. 12 (see Appendix I, item 690).

[15] P. Goodman, *Five Years—Thoughts During a Useless Time*, New York: Vintage Books, 1969, pp. 9-10 (see Appendix I, item 26).

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 198.

[17] P. Goodman, *Like a Conquered Province—The Moral Ambiguity of America*, New York: Random House, 1967, p. 75 (see Appendix I, item 27). This latter point is extrapolated upon in Chapter III. There an attempt is made, while mapping out the nature of Goodman's intellectual thought, to link his human nature conception (particularly his view of man as he could become) with aspects of the American intellectual tradition.

[18] This theme is essentially a restatement of Goodman's various versions of man (man as he could become and as he exists in present society) referred to in Chapter II.

[19] *Newsweek*, August 14, 1972, p. 41 (see Appendix II).

[20] Kostelanetz, "The Prevalence of Paul Goodman," *op. cit.*, p.70ff.

[21] Goodman's anarchist orientations and analyses are discussed in Chapter IV.

[22] *Publisher's Weekly*, Vol. 202, No. 7, August 14, 1972, p. 31 (see Appendix II).

[23] Moritz, *Current Biography*, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

[24] T. Gross, *Representative Men: Cult Heroes of our Time*, New York: The Free Press, 1970, p. 82 (see Appendix II).

[25] *Newsweek*, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

[26] L. Abel, "Seven Heroes of the New Left," *New York Times Magazine*, May 5, 1968, p. 30ff (see Appendix I, item 685).

[27] R. Kostelanetz, "Review of *Utopian Essays and Practical Proposals*," *Kenyon Review*, Vol. 24, No. 3, Summer 1962, pp. 573-575 (see Appendix I, item 559).

[28] Goodman's reasons for so doing are provided in Chapter VI where his critique of formal schooling is evaluated and linked to what is believed to be his three-pronged human nature conception.

[29] Goodman's alternatives to the present school system are afforded generous treatment in Chapter VII.

[30] Moritz, *Current Biography*, *op. cit.*, p. 156.

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] *Saturday Review*, December 15, 1962, p. 703 (see Appendix II).

[33] In an obituary to Goodman in *The New York Review of Books* (September 1972, pp. 10 and 12), Susan Sontag makes much the same observations about Goodman's writing, but from a personal standpoint, i.e., her professional associations with Goodman (see Appendix II).

[34] This does not mean, of course, that he had the practical answers. Goodman is quoted by a reviewer of his recent *New Reformation* as saying that he did not know how to reform: "I do not have the character for politics." See *New Republic*, Vol. 162, May 30, 1970, p. 25 (see Appendix I, item 682). Although he often made statements to this effect publicly, and in his books, Goodman was nevertheless (as this biography reveals) an active and tireless proponent of his own reforms.

[35] For a more detailed account of many of the proposals outlined in this chapter see especially Goodman's *Utopian Essays and Practical Proposals*, New York: Random House, 1962 (see Appendix I, item 16).

[36] *New York Review of Books*, December 23, 1965 (see Appendix II).

[37] R. Glasgow, "Paul Goodman: A Conversation," *Psychology Today*, November 1971, p. 64 (see Appendix II).

[38] P. Goodman, *People or Personnel*, New York: Vintage Books, 1968, pp. 425-426 (see Appendix I, item 24).

[39] P. Goodman, *Homespun of Oatmeal Gray*, New York: Vintage Books, 1970, p. 8 (see Appendix I, item 32).

[40] S. Hampshire, "A Plea for Materialism," *New Statesman*, Vol. 65, No. 1665, February 8, 1963, pp. 186-187 (see Appendix II).

[41] This disclosure prompted Daniel Bell to berate Goodman for "happily playing the heretic in the fields of official clover." See Bell's denunciatory letter "Ideology: A debate," in *Commentary*, October 1964, Vol. 38, No. 1, p. 10, and Goodman's clever reply in "Ideology: Round 3," *Commentary*, February 1965, Vol. 39, No. 2, p. 8 (see Appendix II).

[42] P. Goodman, "The Devolution of Democracy," *Dissent*, Vol. 9, No. 1, Winter 1962, p. 14 (see Appendix I, item 179).

[43] *Time*, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

[44] C. Katope and P. Zolbrod, *Beyond Berkeley*, Cleveland, Ohio: World Press, 1966, p. 78 (see Appendix I, item 439).

[45] Much of the rationale behind this identification (of Goodman with the youth, and of they with him) is contained in Chapters IV and V.

[46] Kostelanetz, "The Prevalence of Paul Goodman," *op. cit.*, p.70ff.

[47] P. Goodman, "The Only Grounds of Solidarity," *Liberation*, Vol. 8, No. 4, June 1963, p. 23 (see Appendix I, item 184).

[48] Moritz, *Current Biography*, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

[49] See Appendix I, item 392.

[50] P. Goodman, "Saving the Liberal Arts," *Commonweal*, Vol. 80, June 12, 1964, pp. 359-361 (see Appendix I, item 198).

[51] *New York Herald Tribune Book Review*, June 28, 1959, p. 3 (see Appendix I, item 516).

[52] P. Goodman, *The Lordly Hudson*, New York: Macmillan Co., 1962, p. 35 (see Appendix I, item 19).

[53] P. Goodman, "The Psychological Revolution and the Writer's Life-View," *The Psychoanalytic Review*, Vol. 50, No. 3, Fall 1963, pp. 17-24 (see Appendix I, item 189).

[54] The tragic aspects of his own bisexuality are vividly recounted in *Five Years*, in disguised episodes in *Making Do*, and in several poems.

[55] Goodman, *Five Years*, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

[56] M. True, "Death of a Literary Radical," *Commonweal*, Vol. 96, No. 20, September 8, 1972, p. 481 (see Appendix II).

[57] P. Goodman, *Adam and His Works*, New York: Vintage Books, 1969, p. 171 (see Appendix I, item 30).

[58] P. Goodman, "What is American?" *Liberation*, Vol. 12, No. 4, July 1967, p. 21 (see Appendix I, item 220).

[59] Correspondence with the writer dated July 12, 1973 (see Appendix II).

[60] Gross, *Representative Men*, *op.cit.*, p. 82.

[61] Youth, particularly college students, quickly forgot George Bernard Shaw's comment that everyone over 40 was a scoundrel when confronted by Goodman on their home ground (i.e., college campuses). In this respect Goodman at one time was a lone and significant exception to the age-typing of youth. He was one of the few (others at particular periods in the 50's and 60's were C. Wright Mills, Herbert Marcuse and Allen Ginsberg) whose experience the radical young considered relevant. This whole-hearted trust and respect for Goodman and his proposals perhaps justifiably earned him the title of elder statesman of the New Left.

[62] In one of his early plays, *Jonah* (see Appendix I, item 25), Goodman wrote a marvellous throw-away line which accurately encapsulates his feelings of frustration and anxiety when faced with an unrewarding task. Doomed to preach to the masses which did not want to be saved, destined to be cast away at sea and swallowed by Leviathan, poor Jonah cries out to the heavens: "It should happen to a dog to be a prophet of the Lord of Hosts." See Goodman's *Three Plays—The Young Disciple*, *Faustina*, *Jonah*, New York: Random House, 1965, p. 38 (see Appendix I, item 25).

[63] *Time*, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

Chapter II

THE HUMAN NATURE INTERPRETATION

Rationale for the Study

What are the kinds of basic questions a researcher mulls over in his mind before he attempts the gargantuan task of compiling data or material with respect to an educator, an educational period, or perhaps an educational philosophy, for intrinsic purposes? In view of the present study they are perhaps the following. Why is it important to attempt a study of Paul Goodman and his ideas? Why should the writer want to study Goodman and his ideas? What makes him important? If the researcher is fairly honest in regard to the nature of his enterprise, the answers to these questions should keep coming back to him in much the same fashion whenever he wishes to reassert his purpose or convince himself (or others) that the enterprise upon which he has embarked is of worth to educational or academic circles.

From among the manifold reasons which flood directly to the writer's mind, three primary reasons for attempting this study continually reappear. In the first instance, Goodman's educational proposals (especially his critique of formal schooling and posing of educational alternatives) have merited the closest and most undivided attention of North American educators since the time of John Dewey. As a constructive critic of the existing educational system, Goodman was and still is in a category all by himself.[1] Moreover, Goodman's proposals for educational reform not only filled the void remaining in educational criticism by the failure of a progressive educational philosophy to take root in American society,[2] but also have never been matched by other educators since the demise of Dewey (Ivan Illich and Everett Reimer notwithstanding).

Because of the not unreal situation of "lag" in all educational criticism (many ideas formulated 5 to 10 years ago are only just "catching on" or being implemented now), Goodman's impact on educational reform is presently being felt throughout both the United States and Canada. Given this predicament, those questioning the inadequacy of present-day schooling must still regard Goodman as having posed most of the questions they have posed (and probably will pose), as well as having formulated many of the practical answers and solutions (in the form of alternative learning arrangements) many of them refer to in their current educational rhetoric.[3]

A second, and related reason for attempting this study, is that the writer believes Goodman more so than any other educator since Dewey has based his educational proposals on a reasonably coherent view of human nature which can be examined as a means to determining his impact on, and contribution to, educational reform, and as a mechanism for explaining the nature and content of his educational proposals. Moreover, Goodman's unified and wide-ranging conception of human nature allows him considerable scope in offering his readers a more effective critique of modern society and its ills than other recent social reformers. It is perhaps this human nature conception, which Goodman kept constantly before his public, and from which he never wavered, that the writer finds most enchanting and so lacking in the writings of other educators and reformers.[4] In the writer's estimation this conception is the key criterion by which to judge or evaluate any aspect of Goodman's writings: it alone gives his writings a unified presence and flavour.

Finally, the researcher hopes to provide in this study a more detailed treatment and searching analysis of some aspects of Goodman's thought than the often casual and sporadic accounts that are now available. To assist the writer in this quest, Eliot Glassheim's comprehensive bibliography of Goodman's works (listing some 700 items) has been consulted during the preparation and course of this study (see Appendix I). At present so few detailed interpretations concerning Goodman exist, that this fact in itself, at least in the writer's opinion, is a primary reason for embarking on such a study.[5] It is therefore not an unreal hope that the present interpretation, related to Goodman's educational thoughts and ideas, may incorporate some general guidelines or procedures for evaluating Goodman's thought in other fields as well. In this respect the study should be regarded as exploratory in nature, rather than a final contribution to all there is to write and say about Goodman and his ideas.

Given the fact that books are already in press concerning aspects of Goodman's thought (see Appendix II), the next ten years should see a more steady and growing interest shown in Goodman's work. Then, it is hoped, this persistent and wearisome antagonist, doggedly challenging his own as well as others' ideas, may yet receive the full and serious attention that might have been paid to him earlier. One can only guess at the countless books, articles, and dissertations to be prompted by his original contributions to several disciplines.

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

The main thrust of this present work is to explain Goodman's conception of human nature by way of providing a framework for formulating his ideas and arguments as well as a base or take-off point for evaluating his contribution particularly to the reform movement in education. It also seeks to uncover (from the same vantage point) much of the rationale underlying his entire thought (educational, intellectual, political, social, or otherwise) as evidenced in his writings. This is an immense task as the writer has discovered much to his chagrin, perhaps more so because of Goodman's recent death over a year ago and the fact that educators are still trying to achieve some unanimity on the meanings and implications of many of his writings concerning human events and affairs, whether past, present, or projected into the future. Before a researcher may benefit from hindsight, or gain access to comparable interpretations of Goodman's thought as broad and as perhaps adventuresome as the one attempted here, more time will have to pass.

Goodman's Human Nature Conception: A Key to Understanding his Thought

The social-psychological and political underpinnings for Paul Goodman's theories, whether relating to his writings on education, politics, or society, are undoubtedly his views about human nature. With Perls and Hefferline in *Gestalt Therapy* (1952) he outlines a theory of human nature which aims to revise and often refine what he conceived to be the dubious findings of Freud and Reich.[6] In this important two-volume study (much of which Goodman admits he wrote himself), the authors develop a number of important propositions concerning human nature which merit close attention and exploration before any full-scale or intensive analysis of Goodman's ideas and contribution to any specific movement can be attempted. Although it would be grossly unfair to give all the credit to Goodman for the ideas expressed in this book, he did thoroughly endorse the findings of his collaborators, subscribing to their ideas (which mirrored his own) in most of his later writings.[7]

The human nature conception, whether explicit or implicit in this as in all of Goodman's writings, often surfaces on his pages like a trained dolphin loyally attempting to display to its public what it knows best or accepts as a given, and, at other times is close to the surface of his proposals, never fully submerged or quite lost in the power and thrust of his arguments. It is from such propositions that the thesis advanced in this study emerges. Stated simply, it is the notion that Goodman's contribution to educational reform (including progressive education reform) lies within his analysis of human nature. This analysis cannot only be linked to, or traced in, his educational thought,[8] but to every aspect (e.g., social, political, intellectual) of his thought.

Of course, having proposed such a connection, the writer is aware that it is not sufficient to merely proclaim its existence without adequate foundation and further elaboration. The task of the researcher must be to develop a thesis or interpretation which unravels the nature and content of this link and which discerns Goodman's view of human nature. This task then becomes the thesis pursued, and the onus is on the writer to prove his allegations. The present exercise is a step geared towards this specific purpose.

The conception of human nature which is presented in *Gestalt Therapy*, and to a lesser extent elsewhere, can be demonstrated in Goodman's writings as possessing three closely-related but distinctive facets or aspects. In the writer's opinion, the key facet of this human nature conception is undoubtedly Goodman's view of man as he could become, i.e., man with his basic nature both released and greatly intact. One reason is that this aspect of Goodman's conception appears to most nearly resemble Goodman's overall assessment of man's basic human nature and it is perhaps the easiest to identify following a careful perusal of his works. Perhaps another is that while this aspect, on the one hand, lends partial clarity to Goodman's overall human nature conception, it affords, on the other, unity, depth, and even credence, to the remaining, interrelated facets of his conception, of which it forms a major part.

Yet a second facet of Goodman's conception depicts man as he is in present society with his basic nature repressed and largely irrelevant to his present functioning. Finally, a third, and perhaps less emphasized, though nonetheless important, aspect of Goodman's conception presents a view of man as he once was with his basic nature fully operative and conserved. Here Goodman's vision of man as he could become intimately mirrors his version of man as he once was in the past. Of course, it cannot be understated that each of these facets serves the purpose of contributing in one form or another to produce Goodman's overall assessment of human nature[9]—an assessment offering a view of man, which gives Goodman's arguments an appeal found wanting in the works of most other educational writers.

The following sections of this study gain their impetus and direction almost exclusively from the preceding discussion. They attempt to present individual and related facets of Goodman's human nature conception to demonstrate the nature and content of its validity when applied to various aspects of Goodman's thought (e.g., Chapter III, intellectual; Chapter IV, political and social; and Chapters V, VI, VII and VIII, educational). More specifically, particularly in view of the interests indicated within the scope of this present study, the educational sections provide the link between Goodman's views on human nature and his educational proposals. In the concluding sections of this work, the writer will restate the general thesis, together with some possible ramifications of Goodman's ideas, and finally map out a few personal predictions and evaluations regarding what he foresees the educational future will be like.

Man as he Could Become: His Basic Nature

> When we treat man as he is, we make him worse than he is. When we treat him as if he already were what he potentially could be, we make him what he should be.
>
> Goethe[10]

> Let us treat the men and women well, and treat them as if they were real—perhaps they are.
>
> Emerson

> Unless we know what man is born as, it is not likely that we shall understand what he is born for.
>
> Ashley Montagu

> The reasonable man adapts himself to the world; the unreasonable one persists in trying to adapt the world to himself. Therefore all progress depends on the unreasonable man.
>
> George Bernard Shaw

Goodman's many-sided treatments of human nature have led him to reveal that man possesses a basic nature, which if fulfilled and allowed to progress without restraint, or if unobscured, will enable him to become what he could become.[11] This account of human nature is a key to understanding much of the rationale for Goodman's relentless pursuit of such themes in his writings, not to mention his educational, social, and political thoughts and ideas.

Working from a simple premise (a characteristic of his), Goodman argues that there is a basic human nature which is in part inherited by the individual. He appears to define this basic human nature as a set of fairly common, yet distinctively positive, characteristics exhibited by individuals in their normal or natural interactions with the environment and with one another, e.g., spontaneity, inventiveness, initiative, intelligence, etc.

Because he contends that many environments have functioned to inhibit or subvert as well as to aid many of the forces of life that are evidence of the individual's expressing his true nature, Goodman proposes the view that it is impossible to tell in advance what a person may become, or how (and if) man's nature will be fully realized.[12] Anything more definite develops from the actual uninhibited interaction of the individual with his environment. Human beings, then, possess the characteristics and capacity to make themselves ever different depending upon their inclinations, the nature of the environment (hostile or friendly), and the kinds and styles of adjustments (within the environment) or interactions (with their peers) they make. In view of this occurrence, the present state of the individual reflects his passage out of an unchanging and essentially unchangeable past (his own or the culture's) towards a future which affords him many possibilities to achieve a new and different state of growth and development, and perhaps promote new discoveries or inventions within his own nature.[13] Thus, this basic nature can be known not only as it has been actualized in achievement and history, but also as it progresses today towards an unknown future.[14]

Perhaps more important and novel than Goodman's view of human nature itself (which is hardly new) is his manner of arriving at it by a process of building up a series of premises which give us not only a glimpse of Goodman's overall conception of human nature but also his world view. This view as interpreted by Goodman never appears to understate his insights into the purpose of life or the "totality" of existence.

Goodman begins his analysis of man's basic nature by advancing a premise which must be accepted if we are to follow his assumptions through to their natural conclusions or if his arguments are to achieve a high degree of credibility. In a manner similar to William James and John Dewey, Goodman claims that there are certain urges, drives, impulses, needs, or behaviours which are dominant in, or necessary for, an individual's healthy self-regulation or uncovering of his basic nature.[15] Moreover, he suggests that an individual's true nature is almost irrepressible simply because these impulses are incapable of inhibition by any external force. The answer is to be found in the malleability of the individual with respect to the expression of his basic nature and his unique ability to release it according to his personal desires.[16]

However, as man is born into this or a future world, and must deal with the particular environment in which he finds himself, it is evident to Goodman that he requires an adequate environment to draw out this basic human nature with which he has been endowed. According to Goodman's conception of human nature, the purpose of the environment is to create an actuality in which these impulses become dominant and this nature is expressed. Any loss of spontaneous life on the part of the individual, on the other hand, uncovers attempts by the environment to deliberately suppress or repress the individual in discovering his basic nature.[17] Perhaps Goodman's reasons for stating such propositions are twofold. On the one hand, he believes that man's basic nature exists as a quality before the environment moulds it, and that the present and future environment can justify itself only in the extent to which it fulfills human demands. Additionally, Goodman maintains that only through the intensive development of different and unique environmental possibilities by different and unique individuals living out their urges that human nature can attain its full stature and capability.

If background conditions are correct and the individual is confronted with an adequate, friendly environment, Goodman is assured that he will undertake a process of creative adjustment to the environment under his own auspices using his inner powers or urges as a guide.[18]

This process in favourable circumstances Goodman suggests is itself an essential part of the individual's expressing his basic nature. Therefore, in some respects, Goodman's approach to human nature resembles that of the Taoists: stand out of the way and let the individual become what he may:

> It is not necessary deliberately to schedule, to encourage or inhibit, the promptings of appetite, sexuality, and so forth, in the interests of health or morals. If these things are let be, they will spontaneously regulate themselves, and if they have been deranged, they will tend to right themselves.[19]

Such a creative process of adjustment is said by Goodman to occur from the individual's birth or beginning as true growth and development.

This process of creative adjustment as developed by Goodman appears to possess two distinctive, though not unrelated, facets. On the one hand, the individual may take the initiative himself within his environment, and grow, Goodman asserts, by assimilating from the environmental setting what he needs for his own development and creative adjustment.[20] In optimal situations, stresses Goodman, the individual in his loose interplay with the environment is in a state of continuous and cumulative interaction resulting in the formation of "completed" or "finished" situations in which the individual's most pressing needs or impulses are gratified.[21] These situations, which may involve such conflicting, opposing, or contradictory behaviours as appetite and rejection, approaching and avoiding, sensing, feeling and manipulating, etc., are described by Goodman as self-regulated, outgoing activities, not mechanical situations, whenever and wherever the individual meets novel situations.[22] Given the contradictions that arise, and the competing loyalties for real objects (both human and material), development proceeds in uneven stages, but this is desirable, because to impose order is against the true purpose of man's human nature. If the individual is continually assimilating something new and interesting, despite the conflicts, Goodman is assured his basic nature will not degenerate and he will never become a slave to his environment. This is because his nature is in large part created or determined by the individual himself.[23]

On the other hand, Goodman proposes that many and various excitements (within the environment), whether pleasurable, aggressive, or painful, vie for the individual's sole attention, and energize him to make contacts in, and creative adjustments with, his environment (e.g., by learning from others, communicating with elders, exploring or feeling his way, conflicting with and contacting material and human objects in his environment).[24] By reacting to excitements emanating from his environment such as these, the individual grows, develops, and expands his boundaries extending his personal associations with respect to his environment and to objects within it.[25] However, despite the fact that the environment often possesses the ability to entice individuals into various activities, the individual voluntarily selects those objects or attachments he requires from within its boundaries according to his needs and desires, rather than have the environment impinge on his true and normal functioning.[26] In this sense, the impetus for all creative activity is entirely in the hands of the individual himself.

Both forms of creative adjustment, whether individually-initiated or environmentally excited or proposed, are said by Goodman to provide the means and possibilities by which individuals in their free adaptations to their environment and interplays with each other grow and develop creatively, releasing their basic natures:

> [A] creative adjustment can find new truth and excitement in the problem itself. New life springs from the collapse of the status quo. One draws on new resources, of compassion to remedy, of study and invention to make prosper, of patience to endure.[27]

If freely and honestly pursued, such expressions of man's basic nature, according to Goodman, lead to the formation of a novel, vital, yet "complete" state with the individual displaying such diverse qualities as, e.g., attention, concentration, interest, concern, excitement, and grace, in his dealings with the environment.

Providing us with a good instance of this "state" in animal behaviour, Goodman has written:

> A dog's action in the field when it's chasing a rabbit has . . . a grace and a force and a kind of discrimination and power of movement . . . which is quite different from a dog's walking on his hind legs and balancing a ball.[28]

Comparing this "state" with the full realization of man's potentiality with respect to the expression of his basic nature, Goodman suggests there are no limits—although the initiative for making contacts rests entirely within the hands of the individual—to the opportunities for creative fusion between individuals and their environments.[29] Thus individuals, in living out this potentiality, are afforded the ability to make themselves as well as their own natures and their environments ever different.[30]

With the potentiality within man's true nature achieved (enabling man to become what he could become), Goodman is confident that this potentiality can maintain its continuity throughout the individual's life cycle (from childhood to maturity).[31] In fact, Goodman would go so far as to suggest that much the same kinds of characteristics (e.g., spontaneity, imagination, playfulness, and direct expression of feeling)—obvious indications of man's expressing his basic nature and achieving his full potentiality—have sustained themselves in more serious concerns.[32] This may account in large part for the "commonness" of man's basic nature throughout history and achievement.[33] It may also suggest, as Goodman feels it does, that these continuing expressions of man's basic nature are only responses to persisting desires or inner urges, not infantile, childish, immature, or illusory—to be warded off—as many societies and cultures have chronicled them.[34] This continuing expression adds only variety, vitality, and ingenuity to the environment—the mechanisms by which man reaches new heights of creative achievement.

Man as he Is: His Repressed Nature in Present Society

> A cripple, a monster! [Man is] forced to develop some specialized dexterity at the cost of a world of productive impulses and faculties—as in Argentina they slaughter a whole beast in order to get its hide or tallow. Not merely are the various partial operations alloted to individuals, but the individual himself is split up, transformed into the automatic motor of some partial operation. Thus is realised the foolish fable of Menenius Agrippa, which depicted a human being as nothing more than a fragment of his own body.
>
> Karl Marx, *Das Kapital*

> Man is born free but everywhere he is in chains.
>
> Rousseau

> There can be no darker or more devastating tragedy than the death of man's faith in himself or in his power to direct his future.
>
> Saul Alinsky

From his many interpretations concerning the modern condition of man which Goodman constantly pursues and perfects in a variety of books relating to a diverse field of subjects, one particular theme stands out above all. That is the view that although man's basic nature is essentially or naturally loving, trustworthy, and creative, etc., "objects" in his environment such as organized bureaucracies and (e.g., school) institutions have served to repress or subordinate its true functioning.[35]

In this respect Goodman believes that even though there is a basic human nature evident throughout time, it is difficult to isolate or discover it in our present society. One reason he advances to explain this occurrence is the fact that mankind has overextended itself with objective values and norms (e.g., law and order; technological advancement; economic abundance; bureaucratic role-playing) by which it regulates life and the growth of human contact—important ingredients in the makeup of man's basic nature.[36]

Once the organizational structures emanating from these objects in the environment achieve a greater importance than individuals and their normal functioning, Goodman has argued, human beings must suppress their humanness in order to conform. Moreover, to impose order or structure where it was previously absent or against an individual's free will Goodman sees as an imposition upon the true directions of human nature. Such "anti-social" activities as delinquency, disaffection, and destruction he suggests reflect the environment's being denied the human scale and the failure to acknowledge man's basic nature.[37] These activities are also viewed as merely indications of the individual trying to regulate his own uninhibited progress in the face or midst of a hostile environment. For Goodman, then, the reasons men are not free are social-psychological and political.

The Notion of Intervention

One important aspect of Goodman's view of man as he presently exists in society is his idea or notion of intervention. Goodman appears convinced that the average person, particularly in his present-day milieu, is raised in an atmosphere replete with interventions, a situation he describes wherein the individual in his interactions with the environment has lost or is out of touch with his basic nature because of the impositions from elements within it (in Goodman's opinion, the present society and its culture provides only a hostile environment). In these situations, the individual is often hopelessly or helplessly divided against himself or becomes ambivalent in his relationships with such objects (both human and material), resulting in the interactions between the individual and his environment remaining disturbed or "incomplete"—i.e., his inner drives or urges are never satiated or gratified.

Such incomplete or unfinished situations create havoc, hinder, or perhaps compete with the attempted formation of any basic nature which seeks to be novel or vital. Rather than the achievement of an optimum state of growth and development which would aid the true functioning of man's nature, we find instead stagnation and repression, confusion and boredom, compulsion and fixation, anxiety and (in more serious cases) amnesia.[38]

Goodman places the blame for this intervention on the environment not only because it plays such a crucial role in the successful functioning of individuals who are incorporated within its confines, but also because it is supposed to aid in the formation of an individual's basic nature. As far as his environmental interpretation is concerned, Goodman surmises, on the one hand, that the intervention may be caused because the environment and objects in it do not allow the individual to adapt to it willingly (e.g., socialization or adaptation may be forced). On the other hand, he supports the view that intervention may occur because the environment wishes to emphasize certain characteristics it deems desirable for its smooth functioning at the expense of the individual's more basic, vital ones.[39] In such cases unfinished situations (where desires remain unfulfilled) which are a by-product of these interventions will not tend to complete themselves unless there is a recovery or renewal of the individual's basic nature and sense of purpose with respect to his environment and its organizations. (Goodman has sometimes referred to part of this process as "restoring the right proportions"). This situation not forthcoming, man's nature will remain unbalanced and his development unequal for as long as his present condition tarries.

Supplying us with what he considers a prime instance of environmental intervention, Goodman assumes that as the individual grows and develops, seeking to both release and conserve his true nature, he is forced to make a deliberate and complicated adaptation to the present society and the available culture as it is perceived. The individual does not creatively adjust the environment to himself, as he should in optimal situations, but learns to adjust himself to the environment:[40]

> In imposing its culture, our society was the most disastrous in history, not by evil intention but simply quantitatively. The culture, like any culture, imposed itself on every function and through the most multifarious channels; but what was imposed was so extremely complicated and technical that it was quite unassimilable by any animal whose powers had developed during a million years of very different circumstances. No wonder the culture imposed itself in stereotyped patterns (authors spoke of "patterns of culture"); and the live animal froze and had to adapt itself by blind trial and error, like any creature in a maze.[41]

When the environment is inadequate (and hence antithetical to the individual's needs and desires which provide the makeup for his basic nature), as Goodman regards the present society, this inadequacy is supposedly reflected in the nature of the individual and he, too, becomes inadequate; most of his forces of love and wit, anger and indignation are repressed or dulled.

Similarly, when the environment, rather than enticing the individual to make real contacts and draw out his true nature, impinges on the individual's free and normal functioning, he is limited in the possibilities or the degree to which he can activate his own creative processes of adjustment within the environment. This is chiefly because his personal style of behaviour has been blurred and his actions compelled by the intervention of objects in the environment which he now confronts.[42] The individual is said by Goodman to not only be denied the essential freedom of being allowed to grow and develop unimpeded, free from external controls, with the power to exercise his own initiative in his dealings with the environment, but also the capacity for grace, free choice, adventure, and creativity, e.g.—clear signs that he has uncovered his basic nature.[43]

Consequently, Goodman assumes, in cases such as these, that the individual may soon begin to condemn a vital, internal need, unleashing its creative activity as a kind of punishment or aggression against the offending, disowned impulse, at one and the same time subduing, repelling or mastering it.[44] This may be why, if the individual does not regulate his own impulses and is bullied or wheedled into manipulating himself to do what he otherwise would not do, he becomes, in Goodman's assessment, divided against himself and lacks confidence in his interactions with the environment. Goodman describes this disowned impulse—an ingredient of man's basic nature—quite vividly:

> Perhaps it is something like the predicament of a wild animal caught in a trap by one leg; under such conditions the leg becomes a menace, and the animal will sometimes gnaw it off and thereby escape, though he spend the rest of his life a cripple.[45]

How can the individual ignore such impulses, Goodman proposes, when they result time and again in realization and satisfaction for the individual himself?

Because of the existence of feelings or experiences such as these, Goodman contends that the individual may have decided that the world is most easily encountered in the present precisely by ideal striving, anxious resignation, frustration, or half-hearted complaint, rather than by direct and spontaneous action which could not only open up exciting possibilities in his environment, but unleash his true nature. Faced with some difficulties in his relationships with the present society, the individual might cling to these forms of expression as they are the only way he can cope with the real facts or the real situation.[46] Goodman also concedes, as Reich and Freud had done previously, that the anxiety which wells up as a resultant effect unveils a character lacking in initiative and confidence, and prone to accept authority.[47] Thus, Goodman is wont to declare that if man alienates himself from his true nature, and because of false identifications tries to conquer his own spontaneity, he creates his life dull, confused and incomplete.[48] What he is then left with is an empty politeness, passive goodwill, loneliness, affectlessness, resignation, etc.—characteristics of man's condition as it exists in present society.[49] Alternately, those who see more sharply, feel more intensely, and act more courageously, are described by Goodman as mainly wasting themselves and in pain, unable to do but little.

Goodman's second example of environmental intervention proceeds according to the premise that objects in the environment (incorporating organizations and institutions in the society or the available culture) annihilate or curb certain characteristics or impulses of individuals (such characteristics being conducive to producing man's basic nature) as part of their self-aggrandizing designs.[50] For this reason, Goodman has proposed on more than one occasion that when a different assortment of human characteristics (e.g., stupidity, ignorance, incompetence, self-contempt, alienation, apathy, and powerlessness, as he has variously labelled them) is being selected for emphasis (as he believes it is in this present society), and consequently other human characteristics are automatically being de-emphasized (e.g., inventiveness, flexibility, resourcefulness, curiosity, judgement), the society or the culture begins to incorporate and credit those characteristics presently emphasized to the detriment of those properties he would term "natural."

Much more likely or credible, at least from the perspective Goodman has analyzed man in present society, is an additional explanation he has supplied for this happening, viz., what Goodman has termed the "conditions of advancing civilized life" render unique aspects of man's basic nature unimportant and unusable in his present functioning:

> Civil security and technical plenty, for instance, are not very appropriate to an animal that hunts and perhaps needs the excitement of hunting to enliven its full powers. It is not surprising if such an animal should often complicate quite irrelevant needs—e.g. sexuality—with danger and hunting, in order to rouse excitement.[51]

Shaped by such objective needs as these which deny certain characteristics expressed by men within the existing order, man's basic human nature, then, is perceived as completely relative, and indefinitely malleable. This condition, according to Goodman, is evidenced in the present-day individual's unbalanced nature and unequal social development.

The conclusion Goodman wishes to draw from these propositions is that any line of action presumed to be "better" by the present social order, with regard to the preceding guidelines, must begin with diminished power, confused awareness, and less motivation. This is because, in imprinting on individuals a crude and uniform pattern, which could easily be repeated in uniform fashion from generation to generation, objects in the environment cut all the threads, and all the fibres and resonances of rich inner life which serve to make man's nature what it could become.[52]

Such action would also involve wasting a vast amount of time and energy, and channelling a vast amount of attention to repressing the spontaneous self enclosed within each individual—expressed as a power or urge which Goodman asserts is seeking to regulate itself against the wishes of objects in its environment or the hostile environment itself.[53] Goodman surmises that this peculiar situation could only become worse because, the more complex environmental organizations become, as Goodman supposes that they will in our modern societies, the greater will be the number of checks imposed on the natural functioning of the individual, and the fewer the creative possibilities that will exist for the individual within his environment. If this is to be his fate, Goodman maintains that man will still be remote in his search to discover his true nature, and that he will forever remain trapped within the unfortunate mould which his present society has cast for him.

Man as he Once Was: His Basic Nature in the Past

> If man should ever beasts become
> bring only brutes into your room,
> and less disgust you'll surely feel.
> We are all Adam's children still.
>
> Goethe

> Let's make common cause, whether to our advantage or disadvantage, just to perfect the common nature of mankind.
>
> The Protagonist, *Tragedy and Comedy* (1970)

Goodman's idealized version of man as he believed him to be in the past attempts to reinforce the continuity between personal and public concern by drawing on the nature of man prior to his becoming part of a mindless, collective enterprise (as evidenced within the present society). More specifically, this viewpoint depicts man in his natural setting prior to the intervention of organized bureaucracies or other "objects" in his environment, and the rise of Industrial Society (Goodman would include among such objects the institutions of formal schooling) in his work and life activities. Overriding any considerations of the modern condition in which he suggests man exists, Goodman proceeds to credit his man of the past with the powers and basic nature of his ideal man (i.e., man as he ought to become). To this end Goodman has argued that man as he once was did succeed in evolving to the point of having approximately the same form and functional properties (e.g., spontaneity, initiative, inventiveness, etc.) as this other version of man prior to the period of interventions in his environment.[55]

In suggesting a connection between his two versions of man, Goodman supposes that man's basic nature, though perhaps obscured in present society, is a relatively common human nature which was and is much the same for all human beings living in environments throughout the world, unless, of course, problems of adjustment stemming from the environment (e.g., a "hostile" environment may curb the individual's normal functioning) have blocked the individual from uncovering it.[56] Although he realizes that it must be discovered anew by every individual in his own way and, if necessary, improved upon, Goodman professes that this common human nature has remained unchanged throughout history and tradition.[57] As far as Goodman is concerned, it is and has always been the same predominant ingredient evident in any worthwhile enterprise and creative achievement reflected in the attainments of past societies and past cultures.

Referring to the link between such expressions of man's basic nature and his past achievements, Goodman acknowledges that men are

> . . . free organisms but also parts of mankind that has historically made itself with great inspirations and terrible conflicts. We cannot slough off the accumulations of it, however burdensome, without being trivial and finally servile.[58]

Goodman concludes that man should preserve this basic nature where it remains or is to be found in modern society, or restore and recover it where it has been lost.[59] In many respects it could be assumed that Goodman would be more than satisfied if man's basic nature could reveal itself once more as reflected in such creative periods throughout history and tradition as the Reformation (most noticeably in the works of Luther and Milton), and the Enlightenment (in the individual expressions of Kant and Jefferson). Clearly, Goodman wishes to keep the memory of these visions of man fresh and alive within the present social order by preventing the existing cultural patterns from becoming too rigid.

According to Goodman, man as he once lived in his environment of the past[60] had ample opportunity to both perfect and release his basic nature. This was because the primary (i.e., pre-industrial) community (in Goodman's eyes the finest environment ever known to man) enabled individuals to grow and develop unimpeded within the entire community, free from external controls. The alternatives available within his environment at this time enticed the individual to draw out his true nature and choose various objects or attachments depending on his desire of the moment. Conflicting with these objects in his environment and interacting with other people, the individual went on growing and developing for the term of his natural life. He was continually assimilating something new, or exploring a new possibility within his basic nature which he had still to uncover, or hitherto had not pursued.

This kind of individual revealed by Goodman was also linked to his own schedule of positive, inner urges or impulses. However, these quite desirable forms of individual expression usually resulted in a quite desirable social harmony: this was because the individual consulted his elders and peers whenever he wished, and his actions benefited, rather than detracted from, the general good. No form of community punishment or control seemed necessary or justified as the consequences of, and moral responsibilities for, the individual's actions were reasonably clear.

If this form of man who once freely roamed the earth's environments can be recaptured, Goodman is optimistic enough to believe that man's nature can be preserved from degeneration, and that cultures and societies can be prevented from subverting its true and normal functioning.[61] Similarly, by keeping this version of man and his basic nature distinctly visible, Goodman reassures us that man will forever become not only what he could (and in his opinion, ought to) become, but also what he was at one time.

Implications of Man as he Is in Present Society: Restoring the Right Proportions

> The unique powers and initiative of each individual must be rediscovered, and used as a basis for work which contributes to the good of the community, rather than melted down in the collectivist pot of conformity.
>
> Rollo May, *Man's Search for Himself*

In attempting to seek a solution to the puzzling question of how interventions occurring within the existing social order can be healed, and how man's present and future existence can be improved, Goodman advances a complementary idea (i.e., to his notion of intervention) called restoring the right proportions.[62] This important notion may involve having to renew or recover man's purpose (because of the problem of interventions in a society at present strictly organized and conformist) with respect to his environment and its institutions.[63] A secondary concern may be the provision of ways for the recovery of man's basic nature, which has been lost, or a reorganization of the repressing forces now latent in man to positive value and concerns.[64]

If the inhibition is lifted, or man's purpose restored, Goodman assures us that what was held in does not then passively emerge. Rather, the person actively and eagerly brings it forth. For instance, Goodman reveals that the use of therapy (perhaps within small schools) for the recuperation and regeneration of the muted powers of individuals is one way of mending interventions in a creative fashion. Another strategy, more *apropos* to the context of this present work, is the provision of healing communities (e.g., mini-schools, communities of scholars) designed to acquaint the individual with adequate objects in his environment so he is more confident of meeting the needs and capacities of his continuing growth and development as his life progresses.[65]

From this interpretation of restoring the right proportions an attempt is made to scale down the size of the environment to human proportions so that individuals can handle it with skill and without fear, passivity, or restraint. This attempt fulfilled, the underlying plan behind the idea of restoring the right proportions—to mix the individual with his environment so that workable goals and desirable opportunities are set up to entice or draw out the "real person"—is finally attained.[66] This mix Goodman presumes will lead to the recovery and renewal of man and his purpose in institutions within his environment, and help to best incorporate or bring out his true nature.[67] Undoubtedly, in Goodman's overall schema, restoring the right proportions within the existing society is an important preliminary or prior step towards enabling man to throw off the uncomfortable burden of his past (i.e., his condition in present society) so that he may look forward to a better future within a new and improved social order.

Implications and Consequences of Man as he Once Was and Could Become: the Relationship Between Man's Basic Nature and the Rise and Development of a New Social Order

> Your name is New Beginning.
> I love you, New Beginning.
>
> Paul Goodman, *Seeds of Liberation*

Goodman's idealistic conception of human nature not only provides us with a picture of a man as he once was and could become, but also charts a path or direction for the launching and progression of a new social order, radically different in nature from the existing one, aspects of which he despised. The new order arises as a result of the ideals of social revolution being built into the existing order by continuing expressions of man's basic nature (e.g., energy, desires, curiosity, ingenuity, etc.) growing into the environment in the form of social properties and becoming part of it. As these social ideals of individuals achieve some worth and importance within the environment, they are professed to anticipate what the social order of the future should be, and thereby help to create it.[68] Goodman defines these ideals as

> . . . humane labour, physical security and freedom, mutual aid; and among more thoughtful revolutionaries, the humanizing of technology and the ethical measure of production and consumption. These social ideals are simple and integral, not an amalgam; they are close to every concern and causally grounded in the universal spread of the technology and economy; but of course they are not fundamentally cultural at all.[69]

The conclusion Goodman wishes to draw from this statement is that although these social ideals emerge in the historical conditions of the particular society that fosters or requires them, they are not "patterns of culture" (as Ruth Benedict and others have suggested), but representations of discoveries and inventions wrought by and within man's basic nature. In this sense they are what constitutes tradition and history, as well as representative examples of what man could become (because often these ideals continue from the past and are never completed or perfected in the present social order).[70]

If expressions of man's basic nature leave the present generation with a clear picture of what man could become and what he once was, Goodman optimistically assumes that our existing social condition is not imperative. It does not enshrine or encompass the only possibility for man. There is an axiom of hope. That hope is simply that civilization (which incorporates the present society and its culture) can advance creatively to great heights with a new and vastly improved social order, comforted in the knowledge that man has made himself today for a better future.

Footnotes to Chapter II

[1] Goodman died in August of 1972.

[2] This point is elaborated upon in Chapter V, where the writer attempts to evaluate Goodman's educational "stance" *vis-à-vis* the Progressives and "Neo-Progressives."

[3] George Dennison, in correspondence with the writer (dated July 12, 1973) concerning Goodman's influence on educational reform, contends in much the same fashion: "Not many of the educational reformers in the United States knew his work except for *Growing Up Absurd* and *Compulsory Mis-Education*—but probably all of them had been influenced by Paul without quite knowing it."

[4] The most noticeable exceptions in this regard are to be found in the works of Dewey, Edgar Friedenberg, and Jules Henry.

[5] For this reason, the writer has chosen to dispense with the usual procedure of presenting various viewpoints regarding Goodman and his ideas in the main body of the thesis, and sought instead to briefly discuss their respective merits in a note at the end of this chapter. An additional reason for so doing is that present interpretations of Goodman have little or no direct bearing on the general thesis to be argued by the writer, and therefore cannot be adequately compared and contrasted with the writer's personal interpretation.

Perhaps one exception to such interpretations, even though the writer is unsure of its contents, is Eliot Glassheim's unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, "The Empire City—An Educational Novel (University of New Mexico, 1973), which is the first lengthy attempt to analyze and synthesize Goodman's thought with respect to his epic novel *The Empire City* (see Appendix I, item 692). Unfortunately, it was unavailable at this time of writing, having recently been completed in May of 1973. From personal communication the writer exchanged with Glassheim (correspondence dated July 4, 1973), the author of this work revealed the following:

> My dissertation is mainly about *The Empire City* as a journey towards freeing the self. I dabble with educational theory and I give a kind of summary about Gestalt (as well as anarchism and taoism, which I saw as all part of the same "philosophy").

Yet another reasonably lengthy attempt to analyze Goodman's thought, and judged as quite competent from many academic standpoints, is James McClellan's *Towards an Effective Critique of American Education*, (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1968, pp. 255-301). McClellan takes Goodman to task over the metaphysical deductions and logical bases implicit within many of his interpretations, especially the fluctuations between reality and illusion which he suggests appear to mar or distort Goodman's personal thinking (see Appendix II).

One widely-known, but largely unappreciated effort is Lewis Feuer's *The Conflict of Generations: The Character and Significance of Student Movements* (New York: Basic Books Inc., 1969, pp. 524-528). Within about 4 pages, Feuer offers us the unlikely argument (see Appendix I, item 691) that Goodman's sexual identification with the youth (and they with him) was the sole reason why he strove to appease his followers by engaging in face-to-face encounters and confrontations with members of the Establishment.

By way of contrast, Theodore Roszak in a chapter entitled "Exploring Utopia: The Visionary Sociology of Paul Goodman" in *The Making of a Counter Culture* (New York: Doubleday, 1969, pp. 178-204) postulates the interesting viewpoint (see Appendix I, item 702) that Goodman found an eager audience in the young at a time when his appeal had waned among his own generation. This appeal (as intellectual guru, moral guide, and radical adult), which Roszak perhaps accurately pinpoints, is said to be based largely on the fact that American youth saw a vast ambiguity in values confronting them in their daily lives (e.g., despite their permissive backgrounds, they confronted the possibility of a conformist, careerist adulthood), and gravitated towards an individual who recognized their personal dilemmas or had resolved many of his own.

Finally, Kingsley Widmer's *The Literary Rebel* (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois Press, 1965, pp. 187-198) yields an interpretation which seems as muddle-headed, if not as singularly simple-minded, as Feuer's (see Appendix I, item 706). It uncovers the remarkable generalization that Goodman, like most "literary rebels" loves to participate in programmatic moralizing and paternalistic rebelliousness, both of which Widmer fiercely concludes do not bring to fruition a new truth or life style commensurate with the rebel's secret desires. On the other hand, Goodman's remarks are construed as revealing spite, conceit, and fantasies of self importance, rather than offering his readers practical alternatives.

Undoubtedly, if all of these interpretations are taken seriously, and supposed to relate directly to the overall purpose of Goodman's thoughts, actions, and ideas, they pose an injustice to Goodman and detract from the wide-ranging goals which this researcher feels he had, correctly or misguidedly, foremost in his mind. In this respect, it is unfair to isolate one aspect of Goodman's thought and sensationalize it (whether in good or bad fashion), and for this reason many of the previous interpretations cited elicit no sympathy from the writer.

[6] F. Perls, R. Hefferline, and P. Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy—Excitement and Growth in the Human Personality*, New York: Dell Pub. Co., 1952 (see Appendix I, item 10).

[7] With respect to their personal contributions to *Gestalt Therapy*, the authors confess (*ibid.*, Preface to Vol. 1, p. vii):

> This book began as a manuscript written by Frederick S. Perls. The material was developed and worked over by Paul Goodman (Volume II) and put to practical application by Ralph Hefferline (Volume I). However, as it stands now it is truly the result of the co-operative efforts of the three authors. What began as the work of one author ended up as that of three—each of us equally responsible.

On the question of Goodman's endorsement of the ideas of his co-authors see, e.g., Robert Glasgow's "Paul Goodman: A Conversation," *Psychology Today*, November 1971, p. 90 (see Appendix II).

[8] Obviously, every theory of education is based on some conception of organismic self-regulation or ideas on human nature. The conception, in most cases, is the operation of what the educator considers primarily to be the chief dynamic factor in life and society. However, to reiterate a point made earlier, many writings, especially within the field of education, lack the coherent, wholistic view Goodman has propounded.

[9] The many arguments advanced in Goodman's books bear this point out quite simply. For example, *Compulsory Mis-Education*, *Growing Up Absurd*, *Making Do*, and *Like a Conquered Province—The Moral Ambiguity of America*, present Goodmanesque facsimilies of man as he supposedly is in present society, with his basic nature repressed and irrelevant. On the other hand, the views expressed in *New Reformation*, *Seeds of Liberation*, *Utopian Essays and Practical Proposals*, *The Empire City*, *Gestalt Therapy*, and *Communitas*, bear some resemblance to man as he could become with his basic nature released and preserved. Finally, *The Community of Scholars* and *New Reformation* refer to man as he was during creative periods of the past, e.g., the Jeffersonian or Republican period, the Enlightenment, and the Reformation. Particularly in these latter works, Goodman attempts to provide a link between man as he could become and man as he once was (see Appendix I, items 1-34).

[10] Many of the quotations used in the succeeding pages of this study are gleaned from Goodman's articles, books, and reviews. Their intention within the present exercise is twofold. First, the writer uses them as a device to set off the particular theme he is attempting to pursue in the main text which follows their usage. Second, the writer hopes—and this may be perhaps a futile hope—to recreate an atmosphere in which the awesome presence of Goodman's perceptive insights rules supreme.

[11] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 369.

[12] P. Goodman, *Art and Social Nature*, New York: Arts and Science Press, 1947, pp. 48-49 (see Appendix I, item 5).

[13] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, pp. 374-375.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 318.

[15] These so-called "urges" are an important foundation for Goodman's belief in, and reliance upon, intrinsic motivation for the bringing about of his incidental education schema (see Chapter VI).

[16] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 310.

[17] Richard Kostelanetz refers to this notion concerning Goodman while reviewing *Growing Up Absurd*. See, e.g., "The Absurdity of Contemporary Culture," *Prairie Schooner*, Vol. 35, Summer 1961, p. 153 (see Appendix I, item 540).

[18] P. Goodman, *New Reformation—Notes of a Neolithic Conservative*, New York: Random House, 1970, p. 191 (see Appendix I, item 33).

[19] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, pp. 246-247.

[20] P. Goodman, *Kafka's Prayer*, New York: The Vanguard Press, 1947, pp. 130-131 (see Appendix I, item 6).

[21] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 238.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[23] Referring to Taoist sources, Goodman has described this basic human nature as resembling an uncarved block upon which the individual etches or imprints his unique impulses or urges—crucial elements in the makeup of man's basic nature—by the force of his creative adjustments. See, e.g., Goodman's *The Empire City*, New York: Macmillan Co., 1964, p. 553 (see Appendix I, item 13).

[24] This point is reiterated in Chapter VI, particularly from the perspective that an exciting, enticing environment forms a basis for Goodman's incidental educational ideas.

[25] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, pp. 235, 373.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 228.

[27] P. Goodman, *Five Years—Thoughts During a Useless Time*, New York: Vintage Books, 1969, p. 74 (see Appendix I, item 26).

[28] P. Goodman, "Freedom and Learning" in S. Gorowitz (ed) *Freedom and Order in the University*, Cleveland: Press of Western Reserve University, 1967, p. 56 (see Appendix I, item 442).

[29] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 229.

[30] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

[31] *Ibid.*, pp. 245-246.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 298.

[33] This "commonness" of man's basic human nature throughout the centuries, as envisaged by Goodman, forms a notable link between Goodman's idealized view of man as he could become and man as he once was. The expressed nature of this link is dealt with in a succeeding section of this chapter.

[34] Goodman, *Five Years*, *op. cit.*, p. 257.

[35] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 310.

[36] P. Goodman, *Growing Up Absurd—Problems of Youth in the Organised Society*, New York: Vintage Books, 1960, p. 227 (see Appendix I, item 14).

[37] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 336.

[38] *Ibid.*, Preface to Vol. 1, p. ix.

[39] Both of these characteristics of environmental intervention, besides being elaborated upon below, are afforded quite detailed and extensive treatment in Chapter VI. There an attempt is made to dovetail these parts of Goodman's analysis of man as he is professed to exist in present society with Goodman's critique of schooling as the process is said to presently occur in society.

[40] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, pp. 338-339.

[41] Goodman, *The Empire City*, *op. cit.*, p. 410.

[42] Goodman, *Five Years*, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-63.

[43] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 338.

[44] Goodman, *Five Years* *op. cit.*, p. 11.

[45] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

[46] Glasgow, "Paul Goodman: A Conversation," *op. cit.*, p. 96.

[47] P. Goodman, "Sex and Revolution," *View*, Vol. 5, No. 4, November 1945, p. 15 (see Appendix I, item 279).

[48] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 235.

[49] J. Ellerby, "The World of Paul Goodman," *Anarchy*, January 1962, pp. 1-3 (see Appendix I, item 690).

[50] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, pp. 309; 445-446.

[51] *Ibid.*, Preface to Vol. 2, p. ii.

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 343.

[53] Goodman assumes that this is so even when self-regulation is inhibited in the personal interests of the individual. For example, Goodman would argue that when a child is kept from walking in front of cars, or prevented from drinking poison, i.e., when self-regulation

is fallible, inhibition is necessary, but runs contrary to the wishes of the individual, and may have to be forced. Nonetheless, Goodman warily contends, if people agree to situations in which self-regulation is rarely operative and run society according to such principles, they are content to live in a society with diminished energy and brightness.

[54] The writer has decided not to devote as much space to this aspect of what he believes to be Goodman's three-pronged conception of human nature, primarily because this view of man appears similar in approach and content to Goodman's vision of man as he could become. In this respect much of the treatment of the latter cancels out or overlaps with discussions of the former. Of course, this does not mean that this aspect of Goodman's version of human nature should be neglected or de-emphasized; rather, it suggests only that the writer wishes to give it as much emphasis as he feels Goodman himself has done in his writings.

[55] In his epic novel *The Empire City*, Goodman suggests 1870 as the time around which man lost certain characteristics commensurate with his version of man's basic nature. It is perhaps no accident that the period of the 1870's and 1880's in the United States coincides with a situation of rapid industrialization and urbanization. See *The Empire City*, *op. cit.*, p. 306.

[56] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 283.

[57] *Ibid.*, pp. 281, 452.

[58] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

[59] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 423.

[60] This kind of individual is described at length in Chapter VI, where Goodman's notion of man as he once was is connected to his recollection of incidental education as it occurred prior to the rise and development of formal schooling.

[61] Goodman, *The Empire City*, *op. cit.*, p. 410.

[62] This kind of therapeutic approach employed by Goodman throughout many of his works is referred to, and elaborated upon, from time to time in the main body of this exercise, particularly with respect to how it touches upon Goodman's perception of the situation of man as he is in present society, and the alternative, environmental possibilities inherent within existing society which might aid his recovery.

[63] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, pp. 310-311.

[64] *Ibid.*, Preface to Vol. 2, p. x.

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 253.

[66] Goodman, *Growing Up Absurd*, *op. cit.*, p. 231.

[67] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

[68] The assumption implicit within this particular argument is simply that Goodman's version of man as he could become, in living up to these ideals, would not tolerate present society and the culture as it is and would want to alter it.

[69] Goodman, *Art and Social Nature*, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

[70] It is therefore perhaps the exclusive task of the new generation which is yet to appear to seek ways to uphold these social ideals when they eventually take their place within the social order. See, e.g., Goodman, *Five Years*, *op. cit.*, pp. 204-205.

Chapter III

ANALYSES AND ASSUMPTIONS IMPLICIT IN GOODMAN'S THOUGHT: THE EARLY AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL TRADITION IN ACTION

> In order to have citizens, we must first be sure that we have produced men.
>
> Coleridge, *On the Constitution of Church and State*

> The significance of freedom lies in the use that is made of it.
>
> Louis Arnaud Reid

> As if, having spread a sail over many men, you should say there is one whole among the many.
>
> The Parmenides, *The Empire City*

> People learn in order to multiply the sources of initiative.
>
> Jefferson

The American Intellectual Tradition: Visions of Man as he Once Was and Could Become

While sketching in certain aspects of Goodman's thoughts and ideas, a case can be made for including him in an American intellectual tradition which has been based on a philosophy of free will or notion of unobstructed human nature. Much of the following discussion relates to how this intellectual tradition can be traced and is applied throughout Goodman's writings.[1] Whether identified in Goodman's works, or evidenced by the writer, its standpoint is the self-determining human protagonist and an exciting, enticing environment (related aspects of what man could become and once was), rather than the hostile, impinging environment which thwarts man's basic nature. In adopting this stance, Goodman appears to be merely following James, Veblen, and Dewey in insisting that man is an active agent who responds to the challenge of intriguing possibilities within his environment (i.e., in the Aristotelian sense, a maker or doer in the environment, not a passive reactor to it).[2]

Two general, yet intimately-related approaches to man and society,[3] emerge from the development of an American intellectual tradition which can be implicitly, and frequently explicitly, identified within Goodman's thought, especially that related to his views concerning man's basic nature (i.e., man as he could become and once was):

(a) a uniquely individual response to social conditions such that each sharpening or resolution of social conflict (of individuals in their normal dealings with each other, and in interactions with their environments) calls forth a clarification of ideas previously ambiguous and ill-defined. There is almost a hint at the idea of permanent revolution with much trying out of ideas, periods of protest and dissent, and vigorous libertarian, populist, and pluralist experimentation.[4] In Goodman's perspective regarding what man could become this entire approach is nothing more (and indeed, nothing less) than the individual creatively adjusting the environment to himself:

(b) the vision of a surprisingly consistent, often Utopian, decentralized communal society. Explicit in the intellectual tradition in America is a dream of the good society as a voluntary, loose federation of local communal institutions, perpetually created from below under the power of individual initiative, and issuing from other inventions within man's basic nature. In Goodman's perspective regarding what man could become this is nothing more than the creation and provision of an exciting environment, complete with "objects" (including institutions) which foster and preserve what Goodman asserts it is human to be.

While attempting to confront and keep before us an unwavering and consistent view of this American intellectual tradition of man (and society) as he (and it) could become, Goodman observes that this tradition (particularly in the present society which he affirms offers only an unhealthy social order) has been blocked or prevented from operating because of repressions and exploitations emanating from within the individual's environment (i.e., present society). When this is so, Goodman assumes—and this assumption must be considered if his arguments are to merit further exploration—that people will react, and this reaction becomes visible in the form of a crisis involving periods of protest and dissent.[5] It is then that these approaches of the American intellectual tradition, fused by various combinations within many of Goodman's writings, eagerly emerge.

This assumption of Goodman's, albeit a simple one, is always evident in his writings.[6] However, it is probably most easily recognized and more skillfully developed, even though from differing perspectives, in by far one of his most brilliant solo efforts, *The Moral Ambiguity of America*, the quite interesting, but oftentimes dull *New Reformation*, and the highly readable *Utopian Essays and Practical Proposals*.[7]

Crisis and Dissent: the Emergence of the American Intellectual Tradition

(i) *The moral crisis*:

> The invaluable happiness of liberty consists, not in doing what one pleases, but in being able, without hindrance, hesitation, or restraint, to do in the direct way what one regards as right and just.
>
> Goethe

Goodman's earlier effort, *Utopian Essays and Practical Proposals*, presents the crisis of man (and hence the possible reason for his reaction to repression and exploitation in attempting to unblock the intellectual tradition) as a universal, moral one, i.e., everywhere he notices a reaction (and even revulsion) to the state of man as it is presently perceived.[8] In what may be construed as an important book, Goodman formulates this reaction as the reawakening of a moral spirit within American society, although he is unsure how viable it is, and is unable to gauge its strength. He feels on more solid ground, however, in asserting that no society is "unchangeable" when man has faith and lives out his ideals practically and modestly, often without recognition:

> It is a profoundly moral spirit. If somewhere the colleges are teaching this, they are teaching the most important lesson needed in America, and one that can be learned, apparently, only by the young: that human action is possible, we need not be fragmented individuals in a system out of human scale. In these respects, the dominant system of society is cynically, timidly, or hopelessly immoral. . . . There is a certain amount of experimental "making trouble", but it is a testing, an experiment; it is not rioting and panty raids.[9]

Within the intellectual tradition which chooses to emphasize what man could become, this spirit is conceived, at least in its practical implementations, as a moral liberation coupled with an intellectual freedom (i.e., it involves both sexual and ethical choices).[10] Because (in Goodman's view) of the interrelatedness of these moral and intellectual aspects of man (whose purpose is as much or more moral than intellectual), this spirit is characterized as an individual's acceptance of his unique experiences (including moral needs and desires) within society without regard or due respect for official values or conventional (i.e., objective) norms. Moreover, this spirit is professed by Goodman to possess a political force if extended to its unofficial and natural limits along two possible paths geared towards eliciting from individuals a uniquely individual response within their own environments: (a) those who assert it have a greater insight into reality than those who repress it; and (b), those practitioners who practice it and oppose the norms and conventions of the present society are experiencing the highest and most rewarding personal freedom.

In Goodman's opinion, this spirit requires close and careful fostering by one or a number of revered and credible institutions in order to sustain or promote its continuing growth and development within the existing social order. With this view in mind, Goodman proposes that the universities are the most revolutionary and humane institutions available in the present society to carry out this crucial function. Like Wilhelm Reich, Goodman suggests that students want the universities to declare themselves in favour of this moral spirit (whether as its complete upholders or partial practitioners). One reason he offers is that the university itself attains moral status and gives support, not by imposing upon individuals rules of middle class behaviour, but by signifying assent to, and approval of, change. In this respect, student morality is not subject to negotiation (the Free Student Movement at Berkeley is a case in point), but a value to be both cultivated and preserved.

The overall conclusion Goodman draws in *Utopian Essays and Practical Proposals* is that the major threat to an individual's achievement of a healthy moral climate (and, thus, a uniquely individual response to changing conditions) in the present society is political.[11] Certain institutions within the existing social order such as the university, the police, administrative organizations, and courts, for example, do not grant or acknowledge the imminence of such a climate and are therefore unforgivably tyrannical.[12] These institutions combine to destroy the growth and persistence of moral feelings within individuals which might give rise to increasing human action, and consequently add life or vibrance to the culture. Such interventions are said to promote an attitudinal dimension (often political) to what is real and moral for the individual so that he lacks the opportunity for a uniquely individual response. Because of this occurrence, Goodman conceives of the state and its associated organs as the ultimate form of repressive Super-ego.[13] Confronted with such opposition from repressive and exploitative institutions, the individual finds it increasingly difficult to live out this reawakened moral spirit, especially when he is unable to allow differing moral or sexual principles to enter into his customary social practices. For this reason, the intellectual tradition (especially the possibility of evoking an individual response) is blocked.

(ii) *The crisis of morale*:

> It is the world's one crime its babes grow dull,
> Its poor are ox-like, limp and leaden-eyed.
> Not that they starve, but starve so dreamlessly,
> Not that they sow, but that they seldom reap,
> Not that they serve, but have no gods to serve,
> Not that they die, but that they die like sheep.
>
> Vachel Lindsay

One of Goodman's superior works, *The Moral Ambiguity of America*, posits the present crisis of man as one of a loss of morale. Throughout the pages of this book, Goodman furtively asks: if we survive the present problems of our society (viz., overorganization; man as he is) can anything like we experienced in the past exist again? Here Goodman appears somewhat nonplussed while groping for the answer. On the one hand, Goodman's conservatism and whole-hearted belief in the American intellectual tradition allows him to remember "good" decentralized and localized experiments from the past, which he attests are fine examples of this tradition being practically applied. His keen sense of the present reality with respect to the existing order, on the other hand, permits him to be somewhat dubious about the possibility of these experiments ever being revived or replicated:

> [The] question is whether our beautiful libertarian, pluralist, and populist experiment is indeed viable in modern conditions. We can make it so, both institutionally and because we have the will; the present trends are not inevitable. However, I am not sure that we will make it so, because of the pressure of time and panicking.[14]

Quite early in his book, Goodman offers three possibilities or predictions for counter-action by the American people, two of which militate against the successful resurrection of old ideas or experiments which proved beneficial in the past. Both of these predictions underscore Goodman's uneasiness with respect to the condition in which he feels man and his society presently exist. First, Goodman suggests that people, when confronted with exploitations in their environments, will stay as they are, and hence, become worse as a result. Second, there is the possibility that people, in the face of repressions within their environments, will do nothing to remove them. This may be because they feel they cannot do anything: they are simply powerless with respect to influencing the functions of organizations.[15]

As in most instances with Goodman, however, optimism wins out against pessimism and anxious resignation. Therefore, after developing and discussing each of these predictions in turn, Goodman opts for a third, more optimistic possibility, destined to produce effective counter-action: that man, by the force of his unique moral fibre, will initiate protests and these protests will continue to grow only in proportion as the repressions and exploitations increase or grow within his environment. This possibility Goodman evidences as a positive "counter-force" in American society which could revive traditional and historical American sentiments such as grass roots resistance and conflict, the individual's sense of community, and the release of man's inventiveness and initiative within society to protect liberty for all citizens. Introduced by Goodman as more substantial or qualitative gains within the present social order during the 1960's, these sentiments comprised the basis for a number of libertarian, pluralist and populist experiments: concerning the Supreme Court (on such matters as censorship, political action, and civil disobedience); civilian boards to review police complaints; drugs, churches, arts, the economy, Negro Emancipation,[16] and dissenting youth.[17]

Almost ten years after he wrote *Growing Up Absurd*, Goodman recalls in *The Moral Ambiguity of America* that the real difficulty confronting those who might oppose the present social system, despite the obvious progress that has been made, is the loss of morale by the system itself, including those who comprise it:

> The system of institutions is still grander and more computerized, but it seems to have lost its morale. The baronial corporations are making immense amounts of money and are more openly and heavily subsidized by the monarch in Washington. The processing of the young is extended for longer years and its tempo speeded up. More capital and management are exported. . . . When necessary, remarkable military technology is brought to bear. At home, there is no political check, for no matter what the current of opinion, by and large the dominant system wreaks its will, managing the parliamentary machinery to look like consensus.[18]

If this situation continues, Goodman believes it could create havoc within the present society, probably dampening or swamping the enthusiasm of those who might restore the intellectual tradition in American society, enabling man to become what he could become.

(iii) *The cultural and religious crisis*:

> It is from despair that faith, freed by courage, leads to the development of a complete person in full encounter with reality.
>
> Paul Goodman

Re-echoing a theme he expressed in *Religion During a Time of Dehumanization* (1967)[19] and in his many and various poems, Goodman in his recent *New Reformation*, refers not to a moral crisis, or a crisis of morale, with its underlying political, historical, and even psychosocial ramifications, but in the possibility of a cultural and religious crisis.[20] In this book Goodman argues, in order to meet the crisis of science and the emergency of modern times, that a religious transformation is required. Similarly, to divert the crisis imminent with respect to education and civil liberties requires nothing short of a cultural transformation.[21] In both instances, the crises could erupt simply because the more present society is said to have "progressed" technically, the further science, education and civil affairs become dispossessed of, and diverted from, their true functions. Perhaps a further reason is that man has relied too much on technical means to solve problems caused by previous technical means. However, with the breakdown or purging of former beliefs and mythologies within the present society, Goodman is assured the path is clear for the emergence of a new belief in the sciences, education and civil liberties, compared to that unleashed by the Protestant Reformation. As Goodman delightfully phrases this argument: "[We should] find and say the humanism in new science, the morality in technology, and the community and individuality in collectivism."[22] In the intellectual context (and tradition) of what man could become, however, this belief achieves practical release in the form of community action and a surge of populism.[23]

The apparent contradiction Goodman shrewdly recognizes in the practical application of this new belief within the existing social order is that although we (i.e., mankind) can purge or reform the common faith (in the direction of believing in, and adopting, a more humanistic technology), it is impossible for society to give up the mass faith in the achievements of scientific technology, etc., themselves products of the Reformation:[24]

> The main thrust of protest has not been to give up science, technology, and civil institutions, but to purge them, humanize them, decentralize them, change the priorities, stop the drain of wealth.[25]

Remaining true to the content of these utterances, Goodman is therefore more hopeful of the likelihood of periods of outright indignation, dissent, and protest arising in our societies and their cultures, rather than the possibility of abrasive revolution or open rebellions.[26] With this hope clearly in mind, he characterizes what he terms as a revival of populism in the United States in 1969 as campaigning against the school establishment (educational dissent); the Free Speech Movement and the draft resistance (expressions of civil liberties); and, tax refusal (to protest an inhuman technology or oppose the draft).[27]

Goodman concludes in *New Reformation* that the real problems confronting those who react to repression and exploitation in trying to unblock the intellectual tradition are political.[28] Particularly from Goodman's own vantage point, "it seems that modern economies, technologies, urbanism, communications, etc., demand ever-tightening centralisation and control, yet this method of organisation does not work."[29] Because of the hold such structures possess over individuals in present-day society, people are denied the opportunity to discover the humanism in science and arts, professions and civic institutions.[30] Moreover, the tight interlocking of parts within the overorganized society makes even the possibility of modest, direct, and independent action (important elements within the American intellectual tradition) extremely difficult, whatever the field. The central authorities or dominant organizations do not want to relinquish their power or authority. They simply do not, Goodman realistically proposes, want to go out of business.

In this situation, the central authorities are almost impervious to the effects of, and pressure for, change. They merely enlarge themselves by adding new institutions and personnel, expanding their operations and co-opting those who might oppose them. Faced with this dilemma, Goodman emphasizes that the American public has been so brainwashed and bamboozled into accepting the belief that nothing can be accomplished in an alternative manner from the way it is presently, that it has developed the psychology of powerlessness, resignation, and passivity.[31] As Goodman sentimentally recounts in the preface to *New Reformation*:

> Yet, as I walk the streets of the (December 1969) city, it does not seem to me that the people are less human, less people, than when I was an adolescent nearly 50 years ago. Certainly New York has changed mightily, but the New Yorkers appear . . . only sadder, more harrassed, more anxious.[32]

If this situation (which is remarkably similar to that which he described in *The Moral Ambiguity of America*) is to remain man's lot in the future, Goodman is fearful lest man's creative talents are spent simply etching out an unhappy existence, and trying to ward off or escape being engulfed by a senseless, inhuman society.

Solving the Crises: Unblocking the American Intellectual Tradition

Although he spoke of many crises (in his various books and articles) which had arisen as a result of man's inability to adequately live through the American intellectual tradition, Goodman's diagnosis of the cause of the crisis was forever the same. In his view it was the style of the central authorities in society:[33]

> Throughout society, the centralising style of organisation has been pushed so far as to become ineffectual, economically wasteful, humanly stultifying, and ruinous to democracy. There are overcentralised systems in industry, in government, in culture, and in agriculture.[34]

What was Goodman's solution to this problem? A careful perusal of his works brings to light several appealing solutions. One is unmistakably Utopian, and in many people's opinions could be regarded as theoretical in nature. A second is conservative, in that it wishes to conserve or restore aspects of the American tradition pertaining to a type and style of man which Goodman tries to demonstrate existed in the past. In addition, this solution indicates the past trend towards decentralized, communal societies with their accompanying voluntary associations. Yet a third is said to be functioning actively and eagerly in the existing society (although historically rooted in the American intellectual tradition), and is best illustrated by the present force of youthful dissent and protest.

(i) *The Utopian solution: man as he could become*

Perhaps it is ironical that in an earlier work than the two previously cited, *People or Personnel*, Goodman offered Utopian blueprints designed to overcome the power of the central authorities and recover the American intellectual tradition he loved and respected.[35] Never unwilling to provide alternatives, Goodman stepped adventurously into the void (at a time when few solutions had been proposed by others) with his theoretical proposals. In this important work, he optimistically and critically provided what he thought to be the correct answer to overorganized societies: "The only remedy is a strong admixture of decentralism. The problem is where, how much, and how to go about it."[36]

The solution Goodman pursues in *People or Personnel* (and to a lesser extent in *Growing Up Absurd*) appears similar in scope to the traditional American ideals; the notion of a decentralized society, and a unique response by the individual in communication with objects in his own environment. In both books, he refers to this solution or policy as one of restoring the right proportions.[37] By this he means simply that the over-organized system achieves a mix by any of three measures.

First, because the central authorities are outmoded or antagonistic towards individual experimentation, Goodman proposes that people may decide to withdraw from the political, economic, and social system and attempt to build free decentralized communities of their own (implementing one or both aspects of the American intellectual ideals). Emulating this example, many and various voluntary associations eventually form spontaneously, and are allowed to function freely, without restraint. Undoubtedly, this notion is one instance of the anarchist bias of Goodman—the idea of a good society where persons are unhampered in their true functioning within institutions and associations.

Second, the central authorities desire or are pressured by increasing opposition and protest into building into their own operations decentralized parts as they become aware that their methods are not working. This results in the achievement of increased autonomy for individuals because people are simply let be or because involvement is on a voluntary basis. People are then able to make an individual response within their environments without external restraints or impositions.

A third measure relies upon the healthy tension which ensues between the expression of man's human nature and the functions of institutions or associations. It is proposed as a derivative of the other two measures. Out of the conflict or tension Goodman is hopeful for reconstruction (of the intellectual tradition) as every new proposal, emanating from the culture or within institutions, is supposed to invent or discover a new property of human nature hitherto unexplored. As people discover their humanity, they grow, and new possibilities for social change emerge within the existing social order. Thus, creative aspects of man's basic human nature and man's institutions are continually being fed into the intellectual tradition to uphold its worth, practice and perfect its ideals, and preserve it for the upcoming generation. If stringently pursued, Goodman is confident that all of these measures will restore an important facet (particularly the belief in decentralized, communal societies) of the intellectual tradition that has been partially clouded over within the existing social order.

(ii) *The conservative solution: man as he once was*

Goodman always attempted to keep before his public the idea that many of the vital and vigorous experiments which he argues are only now occurring within American society as a result of protest and reaction had their roots planted firmly in the past. Although grounded in tradition and history, these experiments were said to carry within themselves the seeds for action within the present social order as well as a solution to the existing crises. In this respect the American intellectual tradition (from which these experiments find their theoretical base) is ongoing, and never complete (it resembles an "unfinished situation"), because it is the fate of the present generation to continue such experiments which proved fruitful in the past and may yet again enable man to become what he could become and once was. Therefore, Goodman vividly recalls in idealized fashion, a part or period of the intellectual heritage of America, representative of man as he once was, which uncovered the development of a number of fine, decentralized, free agencies throughout American society (and Western culture), when intrinsically-operated experiments and institutions by individuals replaced the breakdown of extrinsic organizations. As portrayed by Goodman these experiments and institutions are the only model that protesters of the existing social order have been left to proceed with in the present society. They are the works of the spirit of history and are, in Goodman's glowing estimation, how man made himself and was.

Goodman proposes that, during the past, Americans engaged in a number of libertarian, pluralist, and populist experiments[38] designed to infuse society with a community spirit, and to create decentralized, voluntary associations of people existing in free, anarchistic ways.[39] A sense of community spirit was achieved by delegating and dispersing power (i.e., the idea of pluralism) within these associations so that it did not fall in any one person's hands.[40] Moreover, participation within the associations consisted of such activities as initiating, deciding, and acting—situations which permitted the individual free and considerable scope in displaying personal ingenuity (i.e., the notion of populism).[41]

Overall, the idea of establishing such organizations or associations geared to producing unique reactions among individuals was, in Goodman's opinion, to provide within the guidelines of the American intellectual tradition a tolerable society in which the serious affairs of life could proceed unhampered, spontaneously, even eccentrically, within reasonably agreed limits of style (i.e., the idea of liberalism).[42] One case in point Goodman frequently mentioned was the 30 years after 1787 - the Republican period in American history. According to Goodman, both Jefferson and Madison were concerned with implementing viable alternative experimental arrangements for individuals, and with creating a healthy and exciting environment in which to draw out or nurture the individual's human nature.[43] The Republican period, as envisaged by Goodman

> expressed a positive theory about Human Nature: that each man is fired by special interests and is cooperative; he is reflective and executive; he is initiating and obedient to Law; he is conservative and progressive; he is individualistic and social. Naturally, in these polarities, some men or groups would opt strongly for one or another extreme, but these would constitute only transient factions.[44]

As idealized more recently by Goodman, and developed formerly by Jefferson, these frank, direct, and independent actions by man, if successful, tended to increase civil order, rather than nullify or destroy it. Because the units of human service were smaller at this time, decentralized associations in which men participated required a heightened degree of political struggle and conflict in order to achieve and maintain their experimental and innovating basis or bias.[45] Such healthy conflict, openly encouraged and advocated by Jefferson, resulted, Goodman reveals, in a growth of a fundamental stability throughout American society.[46] In addition, Goodman is assured that Jefferson's belief in the collective power of man's inventiveness made for more individually-oriented and initiated experiments, instituted by man often in concert with his peers, with the welcome and likely outcome of finding useful expedients within the present social order (e.g., decentralized procedures; uniquely individual responses) to continue with and improve upon. If something comparable to the intellectual tradition could be restored or practically demonstrated in the future, Goodman is optimistic that man could well shake himself out of his current complacency and become what he has the capacity to become. Not only that, but Goodman is also assured that man would soon know and understand the ideas which have animated mankind, comprehend the traditions in which he lives, and perhaps even have distinctly before him the habitual vision of greatness—all of these earmarks of the intellectual tradition of the past.

(iii) *The present solution: man as he is* [becoming]

In providing his readers with a solution to the problem of how the intellectual tradition can be recovered, Goodman was realistic enough on occasions to acknowledge, because the origins of decay or repression are evident within the present social order, that practical efforts concentrated towards change must primarily begin there. It is therefore no chance happening that Goodman believes counter-forces are marshalling in the existing society which advance evidence for the development of a future, vastly-improved mankind. Whether extrapolating upon, or simply articulating this idea, Goodman has frequently advised his public that the American intellectual tradition incorporated within pragmatic forms—such as grass roots resistance and protest, a sense of community spirit, social invention and individual reaction to pressing social problems—is gradually reviving in American society. In this regard Goodman places most of his faith and part of his considerable optimism in the possible growth of conflict, protest or crisis as counter-forces organize in American society, and as improvements in man's basic nature leave many individuals emotionally cast adrift, unwilling to identify with the system of which they are a part.

In *The Moral Ambiguity of America* Goodman describes the ambiguity in values and inconsistency (and even conflict) between personal codes of behaviour and moral laws as an explanation for the rise and growth of counter-forces seeking to unblock the intellectual tradition. Nowadays people in society are depicted by Goodman as patently aware of the contradictions which exist between sexual liberation and repressive moral laws, freedom of speech and censorship by selection and swamping, progressive education and aspects of formal schooling, and permissive child rearing and child sex practices.[47]

The counter-forces, which Goodman refers to as chiefly a resurgence of populism are supposed by him to offer an alternative to alienation and lawlessness, especially in lieu of the ambiguity in values and inconsistency in norms which permeate every aspect of North American living.[48] These forces, Goodman carefully points out, often run counter to prevailing beliefs or values, or in contradistinction to the present establishment which is depicted as "monolithic, mandarin, and managed."[49] Although the functioning of these counter-forces is not always constructive (e.g., they encompass no political programme or platform) they often achieve credibility simply because they necessarily oppose actions of the Establishment—the dominant system within society that shapes individual ~~tastes,~~ and desires—which Goodman finds absurd, arrogant, self-serving and incapable of tolerance by those who might revitalize and remember the American intellectual tradition. The vital question Goodman poses with respect to such counter-actions is this: will populism succeed in reviving this American tradition within the present social order, or will it be co-opted or manipulated as other forces have been?[50] Unquestionably, Goodman's unflinching optimism enables him to believe that such forces can indeed be successful.

Upholders of the American Intellectual Tradition in the Present Society: the Dissenting Youth

After proposing several appealing solutions required to unblock the intellectual tradition, Goodman's next step is to assign individuals the task of implementing them. Evidently a solution cannot be reached without utilizing people. With this factor in mind, it is undeniable that the burden of Goodman's longing for effective action towards restoring the American tradition in the existing social order (and this fact is hinted at in most of his major works) falls most heavily upon the shoulders of Goodman's loyal allies—the protesting youth.[51] Thus, Goodman acknowledges

> There is hope precisely in the young. They understand the problem in their bones. Of course, they don't know much and their disaffection both from tradition and from the adult world makes it hard for them to learn anything. Nevertheless,

> we will learn in the inevitable conflict, which will hopefully be mainly non-violent.[52]

When posed in more realistic terms by Goodman, however, this idealistic hope achieves more credible and concrete proportions.[53] Over half the American population, for example, is under 25 years of age. Forty percent of those eligible go to college. This involves 6 million students in over 2,000 institutes spread throughout the countryside. Goodman guesstimates, in addition, that 5 percent of this number are already part of the radical movement. Because of the growth and development of school, college, and university institutions, the solidarity of the "youth" movement is professed to be on the increase. One reason Goodman proposes for this is the resistance on the part of the student youth to academic processing, and social or cultural values adhered to by their elders. Perhaps predictably, the result, according to Goodman, is the formation of social communities with an alternative culture almost antithetical in nature and design to that of the dominant system.

One positive youthful virtue Goodman constantly praises in this context is the newly-discovered life-style of youthful dissidents which is a product of such communities or such cultures. As romanticized by Goodman, this life-style is regarded as proceeding by a series of interpersonal relationships which shun roles and status, and exclude power, prestige and caste as merely inhuman and irrelevant social trappings. Because of their exposure to progressive child-rearing practices (especially those embraced by Benjamin Spock during the 1950's) and psychology (therapy, sensitivity and encounter-group training), the youth are deemed by Goodman to believe in honest, open and direct confrontation. They easily and eagerly find or create healing communities, decentralized into neighborhoods, on university fringes.[54] Moreover, their belief in such ideals as mutual aid and the sharing of material resources leads them to shun the privatism connected with their usual, middle-class backgrounds.

In comparison to the affluent style of the dominant system Goodman refers to in all his works, and somewhat akin to the Beats he described in *Growing Up Absurd*, the youth upon whom Goodman pins his utmost faith for change within the present social order have also voluntarily chosen to scratch out an existence bordering on the current societal and cultural definition of poverty (and this choice is supposedly evident in their shaggy clothes and unkempt appearance). Goodman asserts that they can perhaps do this almost unthinkingly because they have always experienced the good life, even the social-psychological benefits of success within the existing society, and materially wanted for little. Nevertheless, they are (Goodman supposes) the first generation to select their own style and standard of living (as distinct from the remainder of society which simply makes do within the socially-prescribed boundaries of success), and their withdrawal from the dominant system can be accurately construed as an important act of defiance and protest.

Employing the spirit and style of the American intellectual tradition as their guide, the youth, Goodman reminisces, have decided to make their own uniquely individual responses to the situation which confronts them in the present society; by so doing, they have resolved to attempt things in their own fashion, casting off external control, and experimenting with decentralized, communal forms found desirable and durable in the past, which might give vent to, and foster, populist, libertarian, and pluralist sentiments. In assessing the worth of these interesting experiments, Goodman concludes:

> Going it alone may allow for new developments. For instance, when the youth of the Beat movement cut loose from the organized system, opted for voluntary poverty and invented a morals and culture out of their own guts and some confused literary memories, they exerted a big, and on the whole good, influence.[55]

Analysed from this historical (and idealized) perspective, Goodman attributes to the new movement (despite its "old" roots) a personal integrity, and a posture of authenticity and commitment.[56]

One overwhelming dilemma confronting the protesting youth, however, destined, in Goodman's view, to militate against the youth ever becoming completely attuned to the crucial purposes of the American intellectual tradition, is that it is extremely difficult for them to achieve what they wish to achieve (e.g., an individual response within society; a sense of moral decency; vigorous experimentation with decentralized, communal institutions) when they are unfamiliar with the world they wish to make. This is a recurring theme of Goodman's, and one he continually touched upon as he grew older and perhaps less tolerant. On the one hand, Goodman asks, how can the youth correct the failed, missed, and compromised revolutions of the past (e.g., progressive education, the sexual revolution, a humanistic technology—referred to in most of Goodman's works)[57] when they are so ignorant about their historical growth and gradual demise in the present society? On the other, how can the youth protect the traditional American ideals (e.g., justice, law, mutual aid, communality) when they possess no sense of their workings from the past, and are unclear of their historical and traditional roots or origins?[58]

In answer to these propositions Goodman makes a tacit distinction between what he refers to as Paradise "lost" and "not yet": "In the present it is not possible (for youth) to know the laws of paradise, but only to make them."[59] Holding fast to this distinction, Goodman proposes in both *The Moral Ambiguity of America* and *New Reformation* that it is not the task of the young to provide or devise a coherent programme of social reconstruction. All they can do, as far as Goodman is concerned, is to realize and live through their alternatives. However, they can be responsible by deciding for themselves and being part of a unified experiment.

In this fashion Goodman is optimistic that the youth can take on viable institutions within existing society (which have demonstrated their value) as their own, making them vital and functional, perhaps identifying with them, being free within them, and participating in their management. Perhaps in this way they can adopt and adapt the American intellectual tradition to fit their present goals and standards. At least, when they are engaged in such operations, they are not, according to Goodman, mere personnel. Goodman's rationale for stating this is the following: "People can go it on their own without resentment, hostility, delinquency, or stupidity, better than when they move in the organized system and are subject to authority."[60] Another (less optimistic) reason Goodman offers us, which appears at best highly questionable, and at worst, slightly inane, is: "It is better to do something idiotic and now, than nothing."[61]

Despite his reservations concerning the effectiveness of the function youth can assume in unblocking the intellectual tradition, Goodman quite contrarily argues in *The Moral Ambiguity of America* (and such contradictions are to be found in most of Goodman's writings) that the youth (even though limited in their dealings with the present society) might trigger off a number of serious libertarian, populist, and pluralist experiments to multiply the number of individuals who are initiating and deciding (in true Jeffersonian fashion) what man may become. This belief of Goodman's, despite its contradictory nature, springs from his incredible optimism, and is perhaps his major hope for the youth. The experiments Goodman envisages are to occur by emulation and cumulation: people initiate them, or the number of experimental groups simply engulf the entire society.[62] Quoting Madison in *The Federalist*, Goodman feels that these kind of experimental groups or associations can and must work:

> [Each] autonomous unit can experiment; if the experiment fails, only a small community is hurt, and others can help out; if the experiment succeeds, it can be imitated to everybody's advantage.[63]

The eternal wisdom contained in Madison's message is easily grasped.

Moreover, Goodman holds perhaps even more ambitious hopes, especially by tapping the anxiety which wells up in the youth, to escape the perilous state of the present society, and create a new social order vastly different in nature and scope from the present one. This would mean, of course, demythologizing the youthful fear that their future has lost its character as a dimension different from the past and the present, i.e., the fear (or emergency psychology) that either nothing can be done to reverse the trend of the present social order, and produce something radically new and different,[64] or that the youth must remain swamped or consumed by their "presentness" (unconscious of their duty to their own generation or to the progress of mankind, and unaware of the world they wish to make).[65] With these fears removed, Goodman is confident that the potential of youth, as bearers of continuous innovation in their environments, can be fully realized.[66] For this to occur, however, they must of necessity continuously promote (and adjust to) new and improved conditions as agents of change in their societies, and perhaps more importantly, rediscover their historical worth as upholders of the American intellectual tradition.[67]

Because this tradition found useful in the past is never perfected and will remain unfinished even if continued in the present society, Goodman suggests that it must be diligently attended to by the new (youthful) generation in order to merely keep those institutions which are an outcome of this tradition in action from wasting away or decaying from want or lack of devotees. Thus, Goodman argues in *Growing Up Absurd*: "If we are to have a stable and whole community in which the young can grow to manhood, we must painfully perfect the revolutionary modern traditions we have."[68] In this respect, the youth may merely be required, utilizing the guidelines of the American intellectual tradition, to complete those revolutions which were compromised (e.g., educational, scientific, civil libertarian, technological, sexual), and vigilantly adhere to, and painstakingly perfect, the traditional ideals (e.g., mutual aid, communitarianism) apparent in their ongoing societies.

If innovations are incessantly being fed into the existing social order to produce a new and vital order (although perhaps reminiscent of one that existed in the past), Goodman points to the possibility of recapturing the decentralized, community spirit and uniquely individual response evidenced in man's past functioning. Obviously, man then emerges triumphant (and becomes what he could become), and the great, Utopian society Goodman has foremost in mind eventuates. The new order which epitomizes this great society, in turn, may then draw out and invent new properties of human nature which hitherto had been lying dormant in man's nature in the present society.[69] On the other hand, these newly-discovered properties of human nature may activate processes of social change to perpetuate, create, or bring about the new social order. If this were to happen, the rise of a new social order and the renewed expression of man's basic nature would be mutually reinforcing, promoting unlimited possibilities for fusion between man and objects in his environment.

Overall Implications of the American Intellectual Tradition in Action: Man as he Is in Present Society as Opposed to Man as he Could Become

From the American intellectual tradition Goodman seems to immerse himself in, and draw upon in his writings, two polarities or extremities with respect to the possibilities or potentialities for man's human nature have some direct and overall bearing on the previous discussion, and even perhaps on Goodman's place or position in the

American intellectual tradition itself. On the one hand, offering us a negative appraisal of man's existing condition, Goodman has pointed to the strong likelihood, especially in our present society, of the individual's attempting to maladjust himself unquestioningly to the society and its culture, which then becomes the sole or prime determiner of all his tastes, actions, and opinions. From this situation of maladjustment, Goodman has argued that it is a short step to the individual's being overadjusted, unable to completely take the responsibility for his own actions, and become what he may. One massive problem in this regard, particularly in the present social order (and this problem is highlighted in both *New Reformation* and *The Moral Ambiguity of America*), is people who have little control over the means of production or power within the dominant system, but are nicely habituated to the complicated procedures and structures of the moment and get satisfaction by identifying with them.[70] Even when they do act in the interest of social change and assume an independent, innovating posture, they are co-opted and contained by the very forces they oppose or wish to change.

On the positive side—and this may well be a reflection of Goodman's incessant optimism, secret yearnings, and supreme confidence in mankind—Goodman counters the argument, outlined earlier, that individuals (particularly the young) who make a uniquely individual response in their environment (adapting it to themselves as the youth are doing, rather than trying to maladjust themselves to the present society), enabling man to become what he could become and once was, are the final opponents to the omnipotence of the smoothest-running machine or the most repressive society or social organization. They are the new heroes (or merely the old heroes reincarnated) of the present age. They are also representative of its last vestige of hope, rejecting superficial norms and values to serve more personal, communal, and valid ones.

Drawing together the accompanying approach to the American intellectual tradition, Goodman has proposed, in similar vein, that decentralized, communal experiments blossoming forth from a mass adherence to age-old values of the American intellectual tradition such as populism, libertarianism, and pluralism, and featuring local control, modes of independent political action and decision-making, and an anti-bureaucratic outlook, pose an alternative culture and vision to the existing social order, especially in the present society where little or no alternatives are envisaged. In Goodman's grandiose schema with regard to the American intellectual tradition, as it seems to have been in Jefferson's, the test of whether a society (and man) is free (or great) is therefore the presence of recognized instrumentalities or associations (i.e., vibrant, viable institutions) which change according to the wishes of those individuals who comprise them. With this thought in mind, it is little wonder Goodman rhetorically questions: "If the young treat them (i.e. associations or institutions) as mere things and are not vigilant for them in order to change them, do not they themselves become very little?"[71]

Footnotes to Chapter III

[1] Because of the paucity of material (referred to earlier) presently in existence concerning Goodman's intellectual background (e.g., other than superficially, we know little about the books he read, the thinkers he respected or the people who influenced his ideas), the subject of the writer's attention is this task, and this alone. It is a classic example of the writer attempting (to requote Goodman quoting Goethe in *The Empire City*) to do not "what he wants," or would like to do, but what he thinks "he can" legitimately do.

[2] M. Greene, *The Public School and the Private Vision: A Search for America in Education and Literature*, New York: Random House, 1965, p. 158.

[3] These two approaches have been wrought not only from the writer's distillation of Goodman's thoughts and ideas but also from many of the views expressed in the following works: Amitai Etzioni, "Neo-Liberalism —The Turn of the 60's," *Commentary*, December 1960, pp. 473-479; Ronald Berman, *America in the Sixties: An Intellectual History*, New York: The Free Press, 1968; Christopher Lasch, *The Agony of the American Left*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969; and H.J. Silverman (ed), *American Radical Thought: The Libertarian Tradition*, Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Co., 1970.

[4] Dewey, Jefferson, and James, for example, attempted to devise institutions that would make permanent non-violent revolution possible. Jefferson in particular believed people must continually rebel, otherwise there is, as he often put it, "no democracy." On this point see Goodman's *People or Personnel*, New York: Random House, 1965 (see Appendix I, item 24). Here Goodman records Jefferson as advising Madison: "A little rebellion now and then is a good thing. . . . This truth should render republican governors so mild in their punishment of rebellions as not to discourage them" (p. 3).

[5] Of course, the rationale for this reaction and this crisis is to be discovered in the nature of the American intellectual tradition itself, including its two interconnecting approaches. If man is denied a uniquely individual response to his environment and dispossessed of his sense of community or opportunity to create a great society, Goodman is certain that man, being the type of creature he undoubtedly is, will not bear this oppression for long and attempt to rebel. Crises, often featuring vehement outbursts of protest and dissent, result from such actions.

[6] For example, in a little known historical work of his (see Appendix II) which he co-authored with F.O. Gatell, entitled *The American Colonial Legacy* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970), Goodman reveals:

> [Some] Americans radically dissent from the values and institutions most accept. They argue that Americans have sacrificed man's inner needs for love, cooperation, and communal peace on the altar of a materialistic outlook which has made citizens competitive and aggressive, taught them to worship power and wealth, and to regard persons as commodities rather than as human beings capable of realizing their full potential. Critics argue that a society whose highest loyalty is to technology and the marketplace, and the creature comforts these make possible, dooms men to alienation, robs them of inner peace and leaves them seeking refuge in the pain-killer of escapist entertainment and forced togetherness. Ultimately it may lead men to destroy life itself (p. 3).

[7] See, e.g., Goodman's *The Moral Ambiguity of America*, Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Corp., 1966 (see Appendix I, item 372); *New Reformation—Notes of a Neolithic Conservative*, New York: Random House, 1970 (see Appendix I, item 33); *Utopian Essays and Practical Proposals*, New York: Random House, 1962 (see Appendix I, item 16).

[8] Goodman, *Utopian Essays and Practical Proposals*, *op. cit.*, pp. 274-289.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 287.

[10] Goodman denies independent existence to animal and spiritual values derived from man's true functioning.

[11] Goodman, *Utopian Essays and Practical Proposals*, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 110-118.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 49-69.

[14] Goodman, *The Moral Ambiguity of America*, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

[15] *Ibid.*, pp. 2, 61.

[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

[19] P. Goodman, "Religion During a Time of Dehumanization," *The Critic*, Vol. 26, No. 2, October-November 1967, p. 18 (see Appendix I, item 228).

[20] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. x.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 121.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

[24] As one personal example of this dilemma, Goodman proposes that when he attempted to purge the universities of military projects, the young attacked scientific research. In similar view, they "wrote off" Western Civil Law.

[25] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

[26] It is perhaps no minor coincidence that this likelihood is also his choice from among three possibilities in *The Moral Ambiguity in America*.

[27] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. xi.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 183.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 144.

[30] *Ibid.*, pp. 106-107.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 183.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. ix.

[33] Goodman uses the terms "organised bureaucracy" and "central authority" interchangeably.

[34] P. Goodman, *People or Personnel—Decentralising the Mixed System*, New York: Random House, 1965, p. 3 (see Appendix I, item 24).

[35] There is little irony, however, about his returning to these blueprints time and again, not only in the works where he uncovered the crises, but also in countless poems, articles, and speeches as well. See, e.g., Goodman's *The Moral Ambiguity of America*, *op. cit.*, p. 27, and *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

[36] Goodman, *People or Personnel*, *op. cit.*, p. 3. Goodman felt that this political maxim required empirical validation, i.e., probably a pragmatic working out of its potentialities by man himself.

[37] *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4. See also Goodman's *Growing Up Absurd—Problems of Youth in the Organized Society*, New York: Vintage Books, 1960, p. 231 (see Appendix I, item 14).

[38] Goodman, *People or Personnel*, *op. cit.*, pp. 376, 384.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

[40] *Ibid.*, pp. 79, 157.

[41] *Ibid.*, pp. 43-44.

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 384.

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 176.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 72.

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[47] See, e.g., Goodman's *Growing Up Absurd*, *op. cit.*, Chapter 6; and *The Moral Ambiguity of America*, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-17.

[48] *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 87.

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

[51] Goodman, *People or Personnel*, *op. cit.*, pp. 284-285.

[52] Goodman, *The Moral Ambiguity of America*, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

[53] Much of the discussion which follows pertains to Goodman's *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-56; and *The Moral Ambiguity of America*, *op.cit.*, Chapter 2: "Counter Forces for a Decentralized Society."

[54] Goodman pictures these activities as their attempt to restore the right proportions within the existing social order.

[55] Goodman, *The Moral Ambiguity of America*, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

[57] See, e.g., Goodman's *Growing Up Absurd*, *op. cit.*, p. 217.

[58] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

[59] Goodman, *Utopian Essays and Practical Proposals*, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

[60] Goodman, *Growing Up Absurd*, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

[61] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

[62] Goodman, *The Moral Ambiguity of America*, *op. cit.*, p. 58

[63] Goodman, *People or Personnel*, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

[64] Goodman, *The Moral Ambiguity of America*, *op. cit.*, Chapter 5: "The Psychology of Being Powerless."

[65] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

[66] P. Goodman, "The Universal Trap," in Daniel Schreiber (ed) *Profile of the School Dropout*, New York: Vintage Books, 1968, p. 32 (see Appendix II).

[67] P. Goodman, "Youth in the Organized Society," *Commentary*, Vol. 29, No. 2, February 1960, pp. 95-107 (see Appendix I, item 147).

[68] Goodman, *Growing Up Absurd*, *op. cit.*, p. 231.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 230.

[70] Goodman, *The Moral Ambiguity of America*, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

[71] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

Chapter IV

GOODMAN'S POLITICAL VALUES AND ORIENTATIONS: ANARCHISTIC STRAINS IN HIS THINKING

> Even though he stands for much that I have come to detest in youth activism, and for the dreariest kind of Palagian heresy, and for notions that proved to be nonsense when Tolstoy was trying to make bricks without straw in his school at Yasnaya Polyana, Goodman is still, to my mind, the most interesting and honest exponent of the anarchist view.
>
> Donald Barr, *Who Pushed Humpty Dumpty?*

When evaluating Goodman's anarchist thought and political propositions, his proposal for a general attitude or anarchist tendency towards individual and societal growth and development should not be construed as a rigid system or anything similar. On the contrary, he felt it was absurd to always have a systematic attitude (what to do or what not to do in a certain or specific situation) about these human matters placing the stress on the individual's freedom and initiative (and trust in his own basic nature) to act in responsible ways for the betterment of his fellows in the community. To say otherwise about Goodman's anarchist position is to do him a disservice.

Though his anarchism tends to be relatively unsystematic as a total view, anarchist strains in Goodman's thinking can be linked or traced back to his ideas concerning human nature.

Man as he Could Become: Extending the Realms of Free Action

> Normal activities do not need extrinsic motivations, they have their own intrinsic energies and ends-in-view; and

> decisions are continually made by the on-going functions themselves, adjusting to the environment and one another.
>
> Paul Goodman, *People or Personnel*

While looking at the various anarchist possibilities for man as he could become (especially with respect to expressions of his basic nature), Goodman formulates the i[illegible] of freeing the natural forces latent within man (particularly because they have been repressed within the existing social order) which give vent to man's basic nature. This means extending the realms of free action so that man can live in the present society and future social order as if it was a natural (organic) society serving man's every need and desire. The consequences of such extensions of free action as evidenced in Goodman's writings[1] are twofold.

Primarily, Goodman's perception of the role anarchy can play in any political programme of change relies for its basis on his most vital ideas concerning man's basic nature: that force, grace, and intelligence (etc.) in human behaviour are possible only where there is a direct, natural, and unimpeded response by the individual to his own environment. Therefore, in order to widen the spheres of free and natural action which reflect (in opposing unnatural, conventional actions and coercive situations) the situation of man as he could become, Goodman advocates:[2]

> Going back to Rousseau, let me suggest the substitution of the word "natural", meaning those drives and forces, on both the animal and human level, which at present act themselves out in defiance of the conventions that we and our friends all agree to be outmoded and no longer "natural conventions", but which in a free society will be the motors of individual excellence and mutual aid. . . . Let us work not to express our "selves" but the nature in us.

> Refuse to participate in coercive or merely conventional groups, symbols, and behaviour. The freedom of the individual is the expression of the natural animal and social groups to which he in fact belongs. Re-examine the "crimes" which seem proper to yourself and see which are indeed not crimes but the natural behaviour of natural groups.[3]

Thus, Goodman wishes to conserve the natural forces or powers man possesses so that he may better accommodate them as he desires to the going concerns of society, such as man's social groups, associations, and institutions. Undoubtedly, man's basic human (nature) characteristics (e.g., spontaneity, initiative) are viewed by Goodman as pragmatic virtues voluntarily harnessed by man himself to extend the spheres of human action, and increase the number of opportunities for personal contacts;[4] therefore, they must be practised and habituated to the ongoingness of societal situations to renew and revitalize man's institutions,[5] and work his social properties (the result of expressions of his nature within society) into the culture.[6] In this fashion individuals find or discover an institutional and communal purpose in adopting a way of life or by their normal functioning.

Concomitantly, Goodman argues from much the same human nature vantage point that the aim of anarchist political action and thought is to create a tolerable environmental background (often an austerely simple one honed to human scale[7]) and leave people alone to freely adapt to challenges from within their environments.[8] From the perspective of man as he could become, Goodman merely wants to institute in the present society or perhaps recover from the past a human and humane environment in which all men might participate as creative and free individuals. This may mean emptying the environmental background of unnecessary "objects" and impositions, yet providing a basic frame (e.g., to transmit institutional forms from generation to generation):

> The important parts of life will always be the things which we do in our own small groups and on our own. You know what they are. They are art and science and sex and God and compassion and romantic love. These should be rich and complex. There isn't one damned thing that society can do to help you with any of these. All society can do is to make sure that it doesn't prevent them.[9]

The idea Goodman wishes to confront us with here is that environments (i.e., societies and their cultures) must not hamper the activities of men; they must simplify the rules and conventions which men may require to live by—in fact, limit these as much as is communally possible, while expanding the spheres in which they may unencumberedly act.

Man as he Once Was: The Intellectual Heritage of Goodman's Anarchism

> . . . [The] mutual
> aid and fierce independence that we call
> the commonweal: these were the policy
> I spoke for.
>
> Paul Goodman, *Homespun of Oatmeal Grey*

From the perspective of man as he once was, Goodman argues that human animals functioned better in the past without paraphernalia (especially organized bureaucracies, central authorities, rigid institutions), and that at particular periods throughout mankind's history, there was little organization in human affairs (e.g., the Jeffersonian period in American history), rather than more or too much—as there is now in the present society. This is an interesting insight in that it recognizes the human condition prior to its being shaped by bureaucracies and States when human beings were deemed innocent, inventive and free.[10] Although Goodman would not revert to or advocate a completely untamed nature for the individual, he wants to conserve man's animal nature, the notion of primary community, experimental inquiry, and harken back to a time throughout history and tradition when the environment was unfettered and uncluttered (i.e., a period of decentralism and communitarian anarchism).

In putting forward this anarchist position, Goodman is careful to remind us that it is a particularly conservative view (i.e., it advocates preserving or conserving man's past bonds with his community, whereby men were made self-aware and coherent by taking part in social activities)—not radical as his critics would have us believe. Therefore, he makes a distinction between ancient political theories based on function[11] (i.e., what works is retained), and modern political theories founded on power (e.g., policing, status, prestige-acting). The true anarchists, as Goodman would have it, embraced the former theory: they took their families and communities and allowed them to proceed unhindered in their environments. Intercommunication arose or took place in accordance with the ongoing activities of existence and this process or function resulted in the drawing up of rules (yet these were kept to a minimum), and the creation of institutions so activities could exist side by side without undue tension, strain, or coercion.

Admittedly, Goodman's understanding of what this style of anarchism practically and ideally stood for was and is (in his opinion) strongly rooted, historically as well as traditionally, in the libertarian, populist, and pluralist past of America, especially from those experiments which evolved in the late eighteenth century.[12] This understanding was part of what Goodman conceived American freedom was, could be, and is, both for the individual and his accompanying environment.

Turning to Jeffersonian theories (especially those related to decentralization) for guidance, individuals who existed at the time of the Republican period in American history, Goodman contends, sought to leave the rules in their flourishing communities as modest as possible, and cut back on institutions to a bare minimum, because interactions between individuals and their environments and between individuals with each other depended upon the idea of what was functioning smoothly and successfully, rather than which person or set of people had what degree of power, or how many institutions were involved. In these communities a person achieved self-actualization by the institutions in which he functioned (i.e., they affected his basic nature, and vice versa), not by the internalization of some amorphous, abstract power. Moreover, the size of organizations was not significant during this period, as their size (as well as shape or form) developed according to the function of the organization and its individuals, whether the organization was an institution, social group, or community association.[13]

While examining Jefferson's ideas and experiments pertaining to the close relationship which existed between communities and their associations or institutions, Goodman also wished to apply Kropotkin's brand of communitarian anarchism which he understood operated in the nineteenth century, particularly in Europe, according to the supposition that only a social order built to human scale permitted free play and variety out of which man's unique potentialities emerged.[14] Because such communities were allowed to proceed untramelled, without external intervention, Goodman felt that they could not help but be destined for successful functioning, particularly as it was not difficult to achieve unanimity, fraternity, and intercommunication (roughly defined as a community spirit featuring mutual aid) except, of course, where power became the basis for human relationships.

From Goodman's idealized perspective of the intellectual heritage of anarchism, the overall goal of anarchist reform and political action was grass roots organization (as much as was required), whereby individuals were able to decentralize and localize life-functions wherever it was feasible, and strive for alternatives that made for more vivid and intimate life. Eventually, creative participation in communal affairs (which multiplies—in the Jeffersonian sense in which Goodman uses it—human initiative) as befitted a man or men resulted.

Man as he Is: His (Anti-Anarchist) Functioning in Present Society

Ill fares the land to hast'ning
ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and
men decay. . . .
Oliver Goldsmith

To whom can I speak today?
The gentle man has perished
The violent man has access to everybody.

To whom can I speak today?
The inequity that smites the land
It has no end.

To whom can I speak today?
There are no righteous men
The earth is surrendered to criminals.
Jacques Barzun

Although Goodman is constantly expounding positive aspects of an anarchist position which often ignores the rise of Nation States, Industrial Societies, organized bureaucracies, and repressive institutions, he is sensitively aware of the negative (anti-anarchist) tendencies of present-day living. Consequently, his writings (particularly *Art and Social Nature*) express a strong desire to check the power of men, States and organized bureaucracies, cramped or cluttered environments, and oppressive living conditions.

Goodman's natural reluctance to accept the inevitability of power relationships arising among men in their communities, led him, especially when expressing his anarchist principles, to develop an extremely skeptical view about man and human nature, designed to put a check on such tendencies arising within the existing social order. Borrowing an idea from Aristotle who, Goodman does not let us forget, preached democracy, he suggests that men (particularly in the present society) show proclivities towards acting in evil ways, and unreliability in their dealings with one another:

> I'm an Aristotelian. . . . I think . . . what we mean by good is what it's human to be and that the problem is how to fulfill the humanity of people. . . . I want to get rid of authority because since people might be evil, you do not give them power. . . . If you allow people to have power they will abuse it. Therefore, I'm against authority. . . . [It's] because I think that man has too much of a disposition to become evil.[15]

Goodman concludes that communities which by their operations allow power to accumulate in the hands of a few or many are asking for trouble,[16] because everyone then has the opportunity to control or unnaturally coerce anyone else under the guise of acting in the interest of community affairs.

Moreover, Goodman sees the State as necessarily evil, not only because it is personally damaging to those individuals who comprise it (i.e., people are too accustomed to considering their individuality solely in its relation to the State), but also because it centralizes power. Although Goodman was one of the first to concede that the State and its organized bureaucracies have been engaged in trying to solve important empirical problems (e.g., to erase or dissolve poverty or class lines), he suggests that danger arises when their functions become fixed and unyielding to human demands.[17] Therefore he is extremely wary of the functioning of organized bureaucracies and other such representative instruments of the State, suggesting that they "create" evil, and that central organizations result in conformity and loss of initiative for individuals.

Perhaps more so than the State and over-organized bureaucracies themselves, however, Goodman is more fearful of the unnatural coercions, top-down direction, and prescription which results from their operations and inhibits or destroys the natural forces of individuals, especially man's nature.[18] Given his oft-expressed alarm about this separation of concern for the individual's natural functioning from actual institutional behaviour,[19] Goodman is adamant that anybody who wishes to perpetually manifest some natural force (e.g., life, energy, curiosity) and express his basic nature is, particularly in the context of twentieth century America, up against an unnatural coercion:[20]

> Anarchism is grounded in a rather definite social-psychological hypothesis: . . . that in most human affairs, more harm than good results from compulsion, top-down direction, bureaucratic planning, pre-ordained curricula, jails, conscription, States.[21]

The problem, as Goodman sees it, is that in our present society coercive institutions have formed a human character so warped and so adjusted that even in their social struggle to escape out of this morass of institutions and over-organization, men no longer aspire to their natural (human) goals, but towards more tolerable forms of the same coercive institutions (e.g., at the local level, instituting or perpetuating segmented forms of corporate institutions).

Besides the functions of men, States, and organized bureaucracies, Goodman is also noticeably perturbed about the psycho-social factors accompanying over-organization which affect people's lives, life-styles, and enforce oppressive conditions upon people.[22] Given the ghettos, crowded living spaces, pollution, mass entertainment, coercive social laws, alienation, collectivism in tastes and desires, loss of identity (anomie) and responsibility which produce variegated aspects of man's present condition, Goodman argues that imposing unnatural coercions and conventions upon individuals in their environments prevents them from adequately expressing their true natures:

> The fact is that at present it is exactly the aim of all organs of publicity, entertainment, and education so to form the personality that a man performs by his subjective personal choice just what is objectively advantageous for the coercive corporation, of which further he feels himself to be a part. . . . Even libertarians acquiesce in these prejudices because their "free personalities" have been coercively formed and are subject to unconscious coercion. The internal repression of spontaneous natural forces is today more than ever, in an era of time-tables and standardized pleasure, the chief means of dispiritment and coercion.[24]

Therefore, existence in such coercive present societies, Goodman chides us, is somewhat akin to a bad joke everyone knows but no one wishes to reveal: individuals know the instinctual repressions which make their existences difficult, but even this awareness has become mechanical and unconscious. By this process situations of maximum coercion are achieved by the easiest of means (e.g., psychological swamping and overwhelming, and social crowding).[25]

Anarchistic Implications and Outcomes of Man as he Is: Restoring the Right Proportions

> When our society, in its time of upheaval in standards and values, can give us no clear picture of "what we are and what we ought to be", as Matthew Arnold puts it, we are thrown back on the search for ourselves.
>
> Rollo May

Goodman's conclusion pertaining to his view about man's drive towards power-mongering and evil actions within the existing social order is that although people have a right to be crazy, stupid, and arrogant (in a society which operates free of external restraints), communities should not proceed to arm anybody with collective power. Therefore, Goodman's alternative (and hence, his proposal to restore the right proportions in the present society) is to seek to fashion a society possessing sufficient flexibility of decentralized communities and autonomous units so that it becomes possible to absorb the natural fallibilities of men without a calamity or excessive disruption. Community functions are delegated so power is dispersed.[26]

But Goodman's solutions are rarely founded on such pessimistic notions; he is optimistic that individuals will be guided by a moral urge persistent enough to survive the destruction of power and authority in their communities, and hold society together in the free and natural bonds of fraternity.[27] This means simply that men, treated as trustworthy, responsible, and honest, may if given the opportunity, become better. Thus, both assumptions, whether argued from Goodman's negative or positive viewpoints, offer the anarchist alternative (including the dispersal of power) as the only safe polity: it restores the sense of community which is missing within the existing social order.[28]

Never quite taking the State and its bureaucracies as an unfortunate given, Goodman's solution for restoration in this instance is to allow disorder to come and work itself out by permitting the organized system and State instrumentalities to almost "wither away," fall apart (into their more natural, smaller "wholes"), or unfold, into voluntary associations and decentralized communities giving some vitality or purpose to the enterprise of living. Hopefully, in Goodman's opinion, the Industrial State with all its mechanisms can be scaled down for human welfare to such an extent that it can result in neighbourliness, conviviality, and a restoration or rediscovery of a community spirit.[29]

Compared to American Transcendentalists like Thoreau, Goodman confronts us with the intriguing possibility that by a general increase in truly independent, self-reliant individuals, and free, individual or communal actions, communities will be ripe with respect to moving towards a state of pure anarchism wherein those who make decisions govern least.[30] Therefore, in many ways Goodman's state of anarchism resembles a situation of liberty or freedom in which unnatural coercion[31] of some by others and especially by organizations is reduced as much as is communally possible.[32]

Within this state of anarchism, which Goodman envisages, men follow the leadings of their own spirit and desires—opposed to external restraints, structures, disciplines, and rules (the assumption being that external control is unnecessary for the preservation of order), and to policing (although Goodman would retain law courts)[33] —rather than the guidelines promulgated by States and their instrumentalities, or organized bureaucracies. Goodman's "man unorganized" is evidently man at his highest with his basic nature restored and smoothly functioning.[34]

With the demise of top-down direction, unnatural coercions, and prescriptions in the wake of the withering away of bureaucracies and State instrumentalities, Goodman asserts that it is possible to achieve an anarchic-style social order, i.e., a situation of (creative) disorder:

> Now I am for disorder. I think that our world is too highly structured, we are overcentralized, people are entirely too uptight about disorder in the streets. When things fall apart they often fall into their natural wholes which are much smaller. If the going gets too rough, there is natural anxiety that tones the noise down. The stubborn opposition of the Establishment prevents things from falling into their natural wholes and instead distorts them into weird, fragmented shapes. At this point, the powers-that-be should pull in their horns—simplify as much as possible, try not to enforce impossible law and order and so forth. Then there would be more hope. People are not violent by nature. They are violent because they are pent-up and because they are frustrated or bored.[35]

In Goodman's view this disorderly state (which replaces top-down direction, coercion, and prescription) may be accompanied by either of two important restorative consequences. On the one hand, Goodman maintains that in a situation of "creative disorder" (Goodman's ideal state), there is less resignation, and more likelihood of exploring and instituting viable social, economic, and political expedients which react and measure up to cheerful criticism and healthy experiment by individuals. Therefore, in the sense in which Goodman has referred to it, disorder then emerges in a creative fashion:[36] it assumes the form of an anarchist society exhibiting such qualities as, e.g., participatory democracy and convivial relationships, and is attained merely by individuals securing each other's freedom to manoeuvre and decide. On the other hand, Goodman assures us that anarchic-style disorder is safer simply because "order" emerges through non-violent actions and activities.[37] He often spoke of the tendency of direct and specific actions (especially political), for example, to increase (particularly if successful) the civil order (and achieve a civil society), rather than to destroy it or lead to revolution. Goodman's reasoning is simple: his situation of creative disorder involves less tension and violence as the expedients freely and voluntarily chosen by individuals make life-functions bearable and workable—unhampered by unnatural coercions.

Finally, to rectify the psycho-social situations in which Goodman suggests man has been unhealthily bound by the ill-fortune of living in an over-organized world, Goodman appeals to individuals to energetically respond to the need for more personal living space, wilderness areas for communal settings, Bohemian-style experimentation,[38] and institutions that would free the mind and body of men to achieve for them a psychological balance.[39] Can one espy a better place to obtain this balance, Goodman often appears to be asking us, than in a communal, anarchistic setting—itself a natural, organic whole? Therefore, Goodman's solution ("restoring the right proportions") to curbing the power of men, States, bureaucracies and their operations, and over-organized life-situations, is forever the same.

Anarchistic Implications and Consequences of Man as he Could Become and Once Was: the Rise of an Anarchist Social Order

> Community might be defined as finding resources in other people, just by their co-presence.
>
> Paul Goodman, *Five Years*

The free anarchist society Goodman has vividly and foremost in mind (particularly in *Art and Social Nature*) does not simply arise as a result of the revolutionary overthrow of the old (existing) social order and its immediate replacement by the new. Of course, Goodman would not rule out the possibility or probability of disruption and drastic change occurring in the individual's anxiety to perhaps more fervently promote the growth of a new social order within the existing societal structure. In fact, Goodman argues that in many spheres of human interest (e.g., economics, sexuality) in which individuals have been engaged, total change has been the norm, rather than the exception.

Goodman's answer to those people requesting the rise and development of a new social order is to devise a piecemeal programme of change for individuals to utilize within the present society.

The new social order is then achieved merely by the "extension of spheres of free action until they make up most of the social life." Human liberation, according to this policy, takes place in "cumulative . . . step-by-step fashion"[40] (as Goodman once remarked "2% of this, 3% of the other"). In turn, more and more societal functions and fraternal arrangements are ingeniously built into the existing order to produce a new one.[41]

Especially crucial, at least from the perspective of this piecemeal approach to change which is to bring about the new social order, is Goodman's concept of natural coercion. Goodman is supremely confident that when the realms of free action are expanded for men within the existing social order (enabling man to become what he could become and historically was), free men in free, anarchistic societies will initiate and decide upon new policies, enter into conflicts with individuals, and coerce them naturally. Such a belief prompts Goodman to suggest that culture and a community spirit are only shared nowadays when there are heated quarrels about, e.g., censorship, sexuality, or draft resistance. The result of these conflicts and actions is predictably Goodmanesque:

> Fraternal unanimity is the social resolution of a natural conflict better than the ability, desire, or judgement of the separate conflicting persons. For the most part unanimity is found not by relaxing but by sharpening the conflict, without unnatural coercion, until the emergence of a new idea through intervention.[42]

The emergence of a community spirit (relying on natural and unconscious ties) in keeping with Goodman's vision of a new, anarchic-style social order is the overall, desirable outcome.[43]

Footnotes to Chapter IV

[1] Here the writer refers mainly (as he does throughout this chapter) to Goodman's anarchist work *Art and Social Nature* (New York: Arts and Science Press, 1947) which includes his later anarchist pamphlet *Drawing the Line* (New York: Random House, 1962) (see Appendix I, items 5 and 18).

[2] P. Goodman, *Art and Social Nature*, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-2.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[4] P. Goodman, *Five Years—Thoughts During a Useless Time*, New York: Brussel and Brussel, 1966, p. 159 (see Appendix I, item 26).

[5] This is because Goodman believes that although these institutions are given to man, he has to take them up as his own.

[6] P. Goodman, (Review of Vernon Vernable's *Human Nature, The Marxian View*), *View*, Vol. 5, No. 5, December 1945, p. 20 (see Appendix I, item 281).

[7] P. Goodman, *The Empire City*, New York: Macmillan Co., 1964, p. 273 (see Appendix I, item 13).

[8] P. Goodman, *Like a Conquered Province—The Moral Ambiguity of America*, New York: Random House, 1967, p. 86 (see Appendix I, item 27). This is a reiteration of his liberal point of view described briefly in Chapter III.

[9] R. Glasgow, "Paul Goodman: A Conversation," *Psychology Today*, November 1971, p. 90 (see Appendix II).

[10] Goodman, *Like a Conquered Province*, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

[11] P. Goodman, "Art, and Anarchy, and Education," in *Ideas on Politics and the Imagination*, New York Outdoor Forum: C.B.C. Learning Systems #548L, 1971 (Appendix II). Here on this taped programme Goodman acknowledges his debt to the ancient political theories of Socrates.

[12] In view of this connection, the discussion which ensues can be intimately linked to many of the arguments expressed by the writer in the previous chapter.

[13] Goodman always introduced a neo-functionalist approach to his analysis of institutions. In every case, he assumed that institutional forms (especially sizes) arose or followed from institutional functions. See, e.g., Paul and Percival Goodman's *Communitas—Means of Livelihood and Ways of Life*, New York: Vintage Books, 1960, p. 21 (Appendix I, item 7); and, Paul Goodman's "Notes on Neo-Functionalism," *Politics*,

Vol. 1, No. 11, December 1944, pp. 335-337 (Appendix I, item 96).

[14] P. Goodman, "Kropotkin at This Moment," *Dissent*, Vol. 15, No. 6, November-December 1968, pp. 519-522 (Appendix I, item 252). Louis Blanc and Fourier were Utopian socialists who preached much the same philosophy in Paris in the late 1840's as Goodman and Kropotkin.

[15] P. Goodman, "Freedom and Learning," in S. Gorowitz (ed.) *Freedom and Order in the University*, Cleveland: Press of Western Reserve University, 1967, pp. 55-56 (see Appendix I, item 442).

[16] Interestingly enough, Ashley Montagu held the same view. See his *Education and Human Relations*, New York: Grove Press Inc., 1958, p. 133.

[17] This is one reason he often attacked Marxists and their beliefs. (See Appendix I, item 281, cited in footnote 6 above.)

[18] Goodman, *Five Years*, *op. cit.*, pp. 245-246.

[19] As Goodman articulates this point quite tersely in *Art and Social Nature* (*op. cit.*, p. 14): "We are bred into a society of mixed coercion and nature."

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13; 17.

[21] Goodman, *Like a Conquered Province*, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

[22] See, e.g., items 91; 104; 120; 122; 125; 142; 144; 158; 196; 207 and 209 of Appendix I.

[23] Goodman, *Art and Social Nature*, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

[26] P. Goodman, *People or Personnel—Decentralizing and the Mixed System*, New York: Random House, 1965, p. 159 (see Appendix I, item 24).

[27] Goodman, *Art and Social Nature*, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

[28] G. Braziller, (ed.), *Seeds of Liberation*, New York: The Free Press, 1965, p. 434 (see Appendix I, items 23 and 374).

[29] Goodman, *Drawing the Line*, *op. cit.*, p. 16. Dewey, it appears, was an energetic proponent of this view as well. See, e.g., M. and L. White, *The Intellectual Versus the City*, Toronto: Mentor Books, 1962, p. 174 and Chapter 7.

[30] P. Goodman, *New Reformation—Notes of a Neolithic Conservative*, New York: Random House, 1970, p. 32 (see Appendix I, item 33).

[31] The writer shall argue shortly that Goodman allows for situations of natural coercion wherein free men in free societies initiate and decide on new policies, enter into conflicts with individuals, and convince them by the force of their reasoned arguments and judgements.

[32] F. A. Hayek in his book *The Constitution of Liberty* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960) supplies much the same definition of liberty as Goodman does for anarchy.

[33] Camus also advocated dispensing with the penal system while retaining the courts of law.

[34] Goodman, *People or Personnel*, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

[35] Glasgow, "Paul Goodman: A Conversation," *op. cit.*, p. 92.

[36] The basis of Edmund Burke's conservative views was similar: he suggested that order emerges in a creative fashion.

[37] This emphasis on non-violence in Goodman's anarchist thought can be traced to Goodman's reverence for Gandhi and Gandhian ideas. It can also be linked to Goodman's interpretation of the findings of Freud and Wilhelm Reich. See, e.g., Goodman's "Gandhi," *Politics*, Vol. 5, No. 1, Winter 1948, p. 408 (see Appendix I, item 117).

[38] This is a major theme of Goodman's novel *Making Do*, New York: Macmillan Co., 1963 (see Appendix I, item 21).

[39] In this particular respect, Goodman's doctrine of anarchism owes much to the psychoanalytic heritage of Freud and specifically Wilhelm Reich. Both of these men placed a systematic emphasis, as did Goodman and his co-authors in *Gestalt Therapy*, on the social context of the individual's psyche, particularly the notion that the health of a society is inseparable from the mental state and psycho-pathology of the individual. Similarly, Goodman's mentor and moral guru, Milton, wished to keep all the parts or characteristics of man together (i.e., related expressions of his basic human nature), e.g., freedom and power, sexuality and adulthood, poetry and citizenship.

[40] Goodman, *Art and Social Nature*, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

[41] *Ibid.*, pp. 32-33. This is because Goodman believes that the idea of the social order people should have transfixed in their minds is, for the most part, submerged in their thinking and needs to be slowly, yet creatively, extracted.

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

Chapter V

THE EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT OF WHICH GOODMAN FORMS A PART: THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION REFORM,

1890 - 1972

In previous chapters of this study the writer has attempted to acquaint his readers with the nature and content of Goodman's intellectual, social, and political thought, and link this contribution to what is conceived to be his views regarding human nature. This task complete, the question still remains to be asked: Why did Goodman propose his critique of formal schooling and educational alternatives? Clearly, the answer lies in the historical background and context of educational reform from which his critique and alternatives emerge. In fact, it could even be argued that, in order to make some sense out of Goodman's overall educational recommendations and proposals for reform, it is nigh impossible to bypass this historical context of which they form a unique or distinctive part. The dominating theories and activities in educational reform from the 1890's to the present time, it is suggested, were provided by progressive education and progressive educators and for this reason the writer feels it is necessary to perhaps trace the historical growth of progressive education, touching briefly on the place of Goodman and his ideas within its general thrust and overall development.[1]

The General Nature and Purpose of Progressive Education Reform

> The child is the starting point, the centre, and the end.
>
> C. Bowers, *The Progressive Educator and the Depression*

The rise and development of a progressive education movement in the United States arose out of attempts by teachers, administrators and educators to cope with the recurring problems of an American society wrought by social, political and economic changes brought about as a result of rapid industrialization and urbanization. What we have come to refer to as the progressive education movement was not, as Max Rafferty has said, simply the application of John Dewey's ideas to American schooling, although few would dispute that he gave the movement its impetus and direction. The progressive education movement encompasses or incorporates:

(a) an ideology (i.e., a set of ideas justifying and helping to maintain a particular social system);

(b) an educational philosophy (i.e., theories, doctrines, intellectual movements, and ways of thinking about education); and

(c) organizational changes (i.e., interests and purposes of specific groups such as teachers, and educators).

As an ideology, the progressive education movement embarked on a crusade of social, political, and economic amelioration, founded on the belief in the power of human intelligence to affect human progress.[2] According to the progressive viewpoint, urban life accompanying the rise of the Industrial State had weakened community and neighbourhood ties, and social conditions in the cities were unhealthy. Ideally, it was felt that the schools could remedy this situation by inculcating values such as habits of order, industry and co-operation—values which Dewey and others said were not being taught in urban and industrial society.[3]

Therefore, particularly in its educational manifestations, the progressive movement arose not only from the desire on the part of progressive educators to enlist schools for building a better society,[4] but also as a response to the challenge of urbanism, industrialism, and immigration. As Dewey says in *Democracy and Education*:

> Men have long had some intimation of the extent to which education may be consciously used to eliminate obvious evils through starting the young on paths which shall not produce these ills, and some idea of the extent to which education may be made an instrument of realizing the potential efficacy of education as a constructive agency of improving society.[5]

In this sense, the progressive education movement could be viewed as a search for an alchemic process that would bring forth a new type of man.[6]

Particularly during the period 1870 to 1920, educators also attempted to progressively transform the philosophic aims and organizational structure of the school. Although the ideal of universal schooling had been achieved, educators grew concerned about the quality of instruction offered in American schools. Many of them had misgivings about a traditional style of education which had emphasized subject matter, knowledge of the culture and traditions, and which gave information, discipline, and guidance for the present and future.

The dissatisfaction among educators, however, was more deep-rooted than this. The revolt against traditional formal styles of schooling was ingrained in the unique situation in which American society now discovered itself. Few educators would have disagreed that the new industrialism was to blame for the ferment in education, because even though the old agrarian society provided children with good examples of sharing in meaningful work, the industrial process revealed itself to the child in different, more complicated ways, underlining the need for producing different individuals. Industrialism saw a tremendous impact on and change in people's social lives and patterns of living. Individuals needed to be transformed so as to cope with the period of transition between the old and the new, the industrial and the agrarian.

With the school systems educating people according to a traditional agrarian life, new patterns of schooling were desperately required. The reasons were fairly clear. On the one hand, educators vehemently criticized the failure of the traditional school because it was viewed as an impolitic solution to real social and personal problems and rifts in American society. On the other, they felt that time-honoured solutions to such problems were outmoded and that tensions were already evident in the rapidly developing school system showing the need and desirability of changing to a more viable concept of schooling. Therefore, to bring some stability to political, social and economic life in American society, schools would become a tool of social change and adjust people to the new conditions by affecting their behaviours, perceptions, and insights.

The acceptance by educators of the desirability of such changes set the stage for the wholesale adoption of an educational philosophy that was child-centred, and the implementation of an approach to educational organization that was novel and revolutionary for the time. With respect to the articulation and adoption of an educational philosophy, educators became increasingly enamoured with the idea that the child should be the subject of educational inquiry, and that learning could be made more meaningful to the child.[7] For example, when contrasting negative aspects of traditional educational views with these progressive ones, Dewey concludes in *Experience and Education:*

> To imposition from above is opposed expression and cultivation of individuality; to external discipline is opposed free activity; to learning from texts and teachers, learning through experience; to acquisition of isolated skills and techniques by drill, is opposed acquisition of them as means of attaining ends which make direct appeal vital; to preparation for a more or less remote future is opposed making the most of the opportunities of present life; to static aims and materials is opposed acquaintance with a changing world.[8]

Therefore, in the new approach, progressive education, by developing the child's physical and psycho-social needs, took heed of his personality, initiative and spontaneity as well. The unique impulses of the child were now looked upon as the natural resources of the educational process. Education, in this sense, became not a preparation for life, as formerly, but rather life itself. The child would merely seek the aid of his own experiences and ability to direct his subsequent experiences.[9]

Finally, the organizational changes which resulted stemmed from attempts to impose an alien educational philosophy with its accompanying progressive ideology onto a traditional school system. Of prime importance was the development of an organized bureaucracy in schools, colleges and elsewhere which emanated from the institutional authority of many of those seeking to solve social problems or promote social reform. This structure was not so much based on expertise, but on the value positions of its controllers (i.e., personal prejudices and ideological commitments). In its early stages, the organization's formal goals were the education of children (especially with regard to the content and methods of instruction). New educational ideas were discussed and developed to produce a "science of educating." In later years, however, the organized bureaucracy was concerned almost exclusively with its own survival in the face of internal tensions and pressures from the environment (such as the Sputnik crisis and the demise of the Progressive Education Association).

The Tenor of Progressive Education Reform,
1890 - 1970

> Co-operative activity, spontaneity, closeness to nature, intimate communication, sympathy—these are to be preserved in the progressive school.
>
> John Dewey (quoted in M. and L. White, *The Intellectual Versus the City*)

During the 1890's John Dewey reflected an interest in the progressive education movement. As a prior step, he founded a Laboratory School at the University of Chicago to test his educational theories. Dewey subsequently proposed an activity programme founded on the principle that life itself should serve as a basis for educational experiences. Indicating the theoretical underpinnings behind his activity programme, Dewey summarizes his progressive approach to educating in the following fashion:

> Abandon the notion of subject matter as something ready-made in itself, outside the child's experience as something hard and fast; see it as something fluent, embryonic, vital; and we realize that the child and the curriculum are simply two points which define a single process. Just [illegible] points define a straight line, so the present standpoint of the child and the facts and the truth of studies define instruction. It is continuous reconstruction, moving from the child's present experience out into that represented by the organized bodies of truth that we call studies.[10]

Perhaps Dewey's most important contribution to the progressive education movement, then, was his de-emphasis of the traditional approach to schooling: he attempted to show in his early writings and experiments that learning academic subjects was not the primary goal of schooling. Undoubtedly, it was not so much the academic learning Dewey was opposed to, but the manner of acquiring it:

> Even in the classroom we are beginning to learn that learning that develops intelligence and character does not come about when only the textbook and the teacher have a say, that every individual becomes educated only as he has an opportunity to contribute something from his own experience, no matter how meagre or slender that background of experience may be at a given time, and finally that enlightenment comes from the give and take, from the exchange of experience and ideas. The realization of that principle in the schoolroom, it seems to me, is an expression of the significance of democracy as an educational process without which individuals cannot come either into the full possession of themselves, or make a contribution, if they have it in them to make, to the social well-being of others, to the welfare of the whole of which they are a part.[11]

Therefore, in once again contrasting traditional views with progressive ones, Dewey protested strongly against a rigid etiquette of behaviour in the classroom, and the separation of classroom learning from the process of living which took place beyond its boundaries.

These important contributions of Dewey should not only be evaluated merely in respect to his development of a body of pedagogical theory which encompassed the tremendous diversity of the progressive education movement, however, but also in his fusion of pedagogical ideas with a concern for democratic living and social reform.[12] In his early writings around the turn of the new century, Dewey appeared apprehensive about the alienation of the modern industrial worker and urban dweller. He believed that society could be reintegrated if the school became a community which made the child aware of the interrelatedness and interdependence of the entire culture. Dewey hoped that the worker and city dweller would then see their own interests in terms of the interests of society as a whole.[13] Therefore, in the Deweyan scheme, school was to take a crucial role in improving society. Consequently, the curricula of instruction was to be evaluated in light of this.

Another proponent of the progressive education movement was Edward Thorndike. In the field of educational psychology, previous theories of learning had stressed repetition and practice, and the importance of reinforcement in learning. Thorndike, experimenting with animals in the 1890's at Columbia Teachers College, cast aspersions (as did Dewey) on the value of traditional subjects in developing the mind. He expressed a strong concern for catering to individual differences in the learning experiences of children, and his application of quantitative methods to psychological study played a significant role in instituting a "science" of education. Thorndike's three volume *Educational Psychology*[14] was for three decades the standard text used in departments of education. During the period 1890 to 1920, both Dewey's philosophy of education and Thorndike's educational psychology were taught side by side. To complete an educational triumvirate, William James, another influential figure in American educational circles, bolstered the ideas of Dewey and Thorndike to provide a theoretical base for the new philosophy of education.

By the beginning of World War I, the principles of progressive education (if not the organizing structures) were fairly well articulated and known. People were aware that an alternative to traditional schooling had been devised. However, schools still pushed academic standards, and the traditional methods and practices Dewey and his associates had opposed persisted despite their efforts to institute an opposing pedagogical creed.[15] Well into the decade of the thirties, essentialist educators like Isaac Kandel and William Bagley diligently supported school systems stressing basic disciplines and systematic instruction in the skills indispensable to a "stable" society.[16]

The period from the end of World War I to 1950, however, witnessed the widespread organizational adoption of progressive education by American schools. Perhaps this was because the public concern for industrial training and social mobility in a modern American economy still groggy from the effects of war had popularized progressive education, enabling its practices to gain in public support, and thereby infiltrate the schools. At the nursery and elementary levels of educational reform, progressive education policies in the twenties and thirties took into account the unique insights and sensitivities of children and attended to their individual developments. Concomitantly, educational environments were designed to enhance the learning opportunities of all children and provide the necessary organizational apparatus for firing children's intellectual interests. The content of schooling underwent a revision as well: the educational ideas of Dewey, Kilpatrick, Rugg, Mearns and Isaacs were applied to school curricula to bring about a change in the structure and flow of educational information.

Perhaps by far the greatest impact of the entire progressive education movement was felt in the Colleges of Education. At Columbia Teachers College, for example, William Kilpatrick, a student of Dewey's, became an impressive proponent of progressive education ideas. He developed the project method which reorganized the curriculum into the form of projects or assignments combining the "purposeful activity" of Thorndike, and the "social setting" of Dewey. The project method sought to uncover a unifying theme for children to explore and then probe down into problems. Hopefully, the child would want to solve the problems, and in so doing he would learn. Kilpatrick's contribution to the curriculum and method of instruction in schools filled the void created in the practical application of progressive education philosophies to school practices when Dewey did not fully explain how his own philosophy was to be implemented.

The Progressive Education Association (P.E.A.), an organization dedicated to the progressive education cause, was formed in 1919 to give focus and impetus to the previous sporadic and disjointed attempts at educational reform. In the 1920's, the P.E.A. became strongly pro-Deweyan in its sentiments, in the hope of adding ideological vigour to the progressive education movement. Reacting to the entire thrust of the psychoanalytic movement in general, and Freudian discussions of neurosis and repression in particular, the P.E.A. advanced the idea that society and its schools should produce unique and diverse Bohemian-type individuals who were creative and untramelled. For this reason the organization opposed external discipline, and rote drill, and urged flexibility in the classroom by demanding that the child rather than what he studies should be the centre of all educational effort.

In 1924, when George S. Counts posed the provocative question, "Dare the schools build a new social order?" Counts charged that they should.[17] This for Counts was the essence of Dewey's philosophy. Moreover, he felt that the P.E.A. should ideologically and organizationally lead the way in this regard. What were the implications of such an idea? If the schools were concerned with solving social problems, wasn't this policy tantamount to trespassing on the operations of other institutions in society such as the home and the church? Shouldn't the school keep primarily to its knowledge and skills function? If the schools became socially oriented, might they not become tools of a particular ideology, e.g., a progressive one?

By the end of World War II, progressive education was the conventional mode of thought, the standard approach to pedagogical issues and organizational problems, as well as the predominant educational ideology. According to Cremin:

> Discussions of educational policy were liberally spiced with phrases like "recognizing individual differences", "personality development", "the whole child", "social and emotional growth", "creative self-expression", "the needs of learners", "intrinsic motivation", "persistent life situations", "bridging the gap between home and school", "teaching children, not subjects", "adjusting the school

> to the child", "real life experiences", "teacher-pupil relationships", and "staff planning". Such phrases were a cant, to be sure, the peculiar jargon of the pedagogues. But they were more than that, for they signified that Dewey's forecast of a day when progressive education would eventually be accepted as good education had now finally come to pass.[18]

From the mid-century on, trends in education appeared to be moving in a direction antithetical to that taken by progressive education. Hosts of writers including Arthur Bestor, Max Rafferty, Robert Hutchins, H.G. Rickover, Albert Lynd, Paul Woodring, Mortimer Smith and Rudolph Flesch attacked progressive practices in public schools and advocated more basic training in academic disciplines.[19] Perhaps the most representative of these critics was Arthur Bestor. In *Educational Wastelands* and *The Restoration of Learning*, Bestor suggested that intellectual training should be the prime task of the school. While attacking the progressive "educationalist establishment" for its failure to provide a basic education grounded on subject matter, he argued that the child's ability to think could be considerably improved by the school's systematic training in such areas as science, mathematics, history, English, and foreign languages.[20] Such basic disciplines, according to Bestor, should be imparted to all.[21] Max Rafferty, a former superintendent of California schools, in his book *Suffer, Little Children*, similarly charged the influence of the progressive reformers with contributing to the weakening of education. He urged that the school should quickly recover its educational functions before American society faced impossible social problems and pressures.[22]

Many of the criticisms also bestowed on the P.E.A. by conservative critics of progressive education had a serious effect on its operations. It was patently clear to everybody, including the staunchest progressive supporters, that the ideological vanguard of the progressive education movement was in its final death throes. After reaching its zenith in the late thirties, and being disbanded in 1948 because of lack of interest, it now hit decline primarily through financial difficulties resulting from a drop in membership, and a lack of interest and spontaneity. In 1955 it formally disbanded. Two years later, the *Progressive Education* journal, the official organ of the movement, stopped publication.

With the success of Sputnik in 1957 all eyes turned on Russia's educational system and there was a strident call from many quarters for a complete reorientation of American schools. Because national prestige was now at stake, educators referred to the "total failure of American education" and criticism of the public schools grew stronger, particularly with respect to their weaknesses in curriculum content. A series of curriculum-reform projects were implemented with the expressed purpose of placing an earlier emphasis on mathematics and science in American schools.[23] However, despite the flood of attempts to modify the specific content and method of teaching in American schools,[24] educators showed little concern for the development of the "whole child," even though they did employ progressive approaches in their teaching procedures. Clearly, there was little use in advocating the mastery of specific facts in order to catch the Russians: what was required was the progressive approach with its emphasis on generalized methods and concepts applicable to a wide variety of situations, and these approaches remained largely intact.

The bruhaha over Sputnik and its aftermath drew out of partial anonymity perhaps by far the most influential educational figure of the late fifties and early sixties, James Conant. Meeting the conservative backlash sternly in the face, he advocated public high school for all American citizens. Conant's report[25] to the American people was extremely blunt and to the point. Unless a secondary school had a graduating class of at least a hundred students, Conant argued, school was not adequately offering a diversified curricula to meet the needs of its students and the requirements of the United States. Urging efficiency in matters relating to education, Conant called for a national testing programme that could provide an educational achievement index (compared to G.N.P.). Efficiency was also to be featured in the approach to vocational training in schools, in the effectiveness in sorting students, and in the increased holding power of the secondary school until every youth had a chance to successfully complete a programme of value to himself and society. Perhaps in this regard the Conant Report was a ploy used by its author and other educators to reassure American citizens that all high school students would acquire at graduation the basic concepts and skills which encourage "intelligent" and "responsible" action in American life.[26]

Now that the tenor of educational reform had tilted full-circle in favour of conservative elements in American society, it was not surprising that an educator of the calibre of Jerome Bruner suggested in the early sixties that progressivism was no longer the major motivating force in American educational theory.[27] The discovery of a new technology, the cataclysms of two global wars, the reign of skepticism which followed the release of a Cold War atmosphere, and the paranoia and self-indulgent soul searching which succeeded the launching of Sputnik had forced American patterns of schooling in new directions. Even the traditional American doctrine (adhered to by Mann, Dewey, Counts and Conant) that schools could be used by society to shape its own best image was called sharply into question. Undoubtedly, the optimism and faith in the growth capacity of the individual which characterized the progressive viewpoint was losing intellectual support.

One example of the current opposition to progressive education was the intellectual commitment on the part of educators to John Gardner's plea for excellence during the early sixties.[28] This commitment appeared to be little more than a re-echoing of their earlier support for Conant and his ideas. "Intellectual excellence" including the "structure of knowledge" and "concept attainment" became key phrases in curriculum building and in the rhetoric expressed by educators. A widely quoted book of the period was Bruner's *The Process of Education.*[29] Even Jean Piaget's genetic epistomology, with its stages of cognitive development, was rediscovered.

Apparently, the cry for excellence was to include everyone, not simply the gifted. A new crisis, somewhat similar to that which followed Sputnik, exhibiting a belated concern for the problems of the rural-urban poor, soon permeated American society in the sixties. In addition, schools were attacked from many quarters as unresponsive to the needs of ghetto children, poor children, all children, and youth. Conant's *Slums and Suburbs*, for example, was an early warning about the unresponsiveness of schools to problems in the ghetto.[30] Nat Hentoff developed the interesting notion that slum children were not far behind other children (especially the middle class) when they first came to school, but the longer they remained, the further they fell behind.[31] Perhaps even more extreme were the frenzied outcries which ushered from the pens of such writers as John Holt, Jonathan Kozol and Charles Silberman.[32]

The thesis presented by those involved intimately in the crisis requires development. They argued that millions of children from disadvantaged families were simply not learning. The schools, rather than solving the social problems in American society as the traditional and progressive schools had sought to do, were seen to reflect an almost insoluble social problem of tremendous proportions. Those educators wishing to solve the crisis placed a great emphasis in the schools on subjects other than mathematics and science, such as the social studies and the language arts. They also attempted to utilize additional teaching aids and technical devices ("the new technology") beyond the textbook to make learning more psychologically oriented. Individual instruction, especially in reading skills, became increasingly emphasized and practiced.[33] Overall, the learning process was made more "creative." In 1965 Project Head Start was initiated with the sole purpose of providing preschool experiences for the "culturally" disadvantaged.

A further crisis erupted when American society suddenly found itself embroiled in a social revolution of cataclysmic proportions. The dissatisfactions and anxieties seemed greater than in any previous period in American history, especially among the youth. Donald McDonald summarizes the major aspects of this dissatisfaction as follows: alienation and estrangement from the values of society; a sense of the meaninglessness of life; an ambivalence towards tradition and history; the atomic age and the Cold War; the technological revolution; and, the rigidity of basic social institutions with their accompanying slowness to change.[34]

Of course, the schools were at the centre of this social revolution. They responded to the mores of a troubled society rather than charter the correct answer for American youth. During the sixties, it appears as if social changes exerted a greater effect on the schools than vice versa, perpetuating and reinforcing the feelings of disenchantment and anxiety of youth. For example, Dr. Spock's permissive childrearing practices seriously affected discipline in North American schools; the civil rights movement in the United States resulted in a greater degree of communication and unrest among interest groups on college campuses; and, student rebellion resulted in the breakdown of authoritarian styles of discipline in schools. In their various manifestations within different segments of American intellectual and cultural life during the sixties, such social changes were also described by Tom Nicely, a close friend of Goodman's, as "beginning with the Freedom Rides, moving through student strikes and the giant peace marches, and ending at Woodstock."[35]

During this period of turmoil and intense change, independent thinkers such as Paul Goodman, Edgar Friedenberg, Kenneth Kenniston, Erik Erikson, Charles Reich, and Eric Fromm highlighted the oppressed and exploited condition of American youth.[36] Goodman and Friedenberg in particular attacked the school's unresponsiveness to the needs of alienated youth. Their criticisms most frequently centred around schools and colleges' training towards consumerism, conformity, and supplying the labour and leaders to continue ongoing economic institutions—all at a cost of neglecting the emotional and social development of young people. In other words, they argued that society's schools treated young people as if they had no voice, rights, aims, or intentions worth listening to, and, most of all, as if they had no feelings.[37] The works of Goodman and other writers were succeeded by a raft of critical books. Highly regarded for their treatment of the youth theme were Bel Kaufman's *Up the Down Staircase*[38] and Nat Hentoff's *Our Children Are Dying*. It was extremely difficult for the schools to ignore what many of these eminent writers said, and when a new group now called the Neo-Progressives said much the same thing, the schools were compelled to listen ever more intently.

Success and Failure in Progressive Education Practice: School Reality versus Progressive Rhetoric

> From the jungle of American cities to the jungle of Africa, education is expected to create order out of chaos. The schools, while operating in the enclaves of the urban slums, are asked to wipe out the ignorance, poverty, and violence that are undermining the schools themselves.
>
> Fred M. Hechinger

Although the progressive education movement had languished with the demise of the P.E.A. and through lack of intellectual support, the visible signs of progressive education were still apparent in the public school system in the 1960's. Despite the fact that it was not fashionable to declare or label oneself progressive, this was not an indication that progressive education had disappeared completely. Unquestionably, the progressive rhetoric had subsided, but the curriculum and methods of teaching in schools had been profoundly affected, especially with respect to the teacher's concern for the individual's physical and psychological well-being. Attention was also highly concentrated on tailoring the curriculum to fit the wide-ranging needs and interests of learners in schools. Moreover, the organizational bases and administrative functions which accompanied the implementation of progressive education philosophies seemed so firmly established in American public schools by the sixties that they appeared likely to continue into the next decade.

In evaluating the legacy of the progressive education movement, its successes in solving the organizational problems which had hampered and beset the traditional public schools should be given credit. The movement had a marked effect on school efficiency, school routine, and the content of the school curriculum.

More specifically, progressive education appeared to function successfully in possibly three important areas of concern. First, progressive education alleviated custodial problems created by the emergence of an extremely varied student body during a period of rapid urbanism and industrialism in twentieth century America. Particularly under the banner of progressive education the schools willingly seized a major share of the child's time and thereby relieved many tortured parents of the task of bringing up and educating their children. One reason proposed for this seizure was the declining influences of the family unit and the sense of community in modern America. During its decipherment by discerning school mandarins, progressive education sought through its custodial operations to maintain the student's interests, instil in him the wish to stay in school, initiate extra-curricular activities, and redefine academic standards.[39]

Second, progressive education in its application to schooling helped to legitimize the numerous non-academic activities performed by school personnel which had been creeping into the early traditional public schools because of the rise in student enrollments. Previously, many kinds of work were said to contribute to education; now, it was argued, all work could contribute to the child's welfare—even non-academic activities (e.g., vocational guidance counselling, physical education instruction, supervisory functions). One carry-over of the progressive education policies of the fifties and sixties, therefore, was a belief in the use of expertise and a more streamlined bureaucracy. Clearly, the growth and development of progressive schooling created or gave rise to a professional class of professors of education, educational administrators, teachers, and other school officials.[40]

Third, progressive education deferred and deterred attacks upon the competence of public schools and their personnel by considerably shifting the school's emphasis from subject matter to students. For this reason it became extremely difficult for anyone, including parents, to prove that schools were not educating the "whole child," because under the new educational system it was hard to judge the child's progress throughout the schooling process.

Despite the fact that the organizational complexities accompanying the progressive education movement tended to nullify and dissipate the former oppressive image of its traditional predecessors, Dewey and his followers failed to inspire a child-centred sentiment or educate the "whole child."[41] Stripped of its main thrust, the entire progressive movement was like the husk of a coconut with its substance removed.

Dewey, though, was aware that progressive education differed from what its originators had in mind. Many of his followers, he complained, and especially progressive educators, did not understand his ideas or garbled them to use for their own purposes.[42] Dewey therefore criticized progressive education, attacking some of its manifestations as "stupid," and boycotted the P.E.A., the organization devoted to the cause he once advocated. What appeared questionable was how many truly progressive schools existed. The gulf between the stated, original aims of the ideology and its actual functioning had never seemed wider.[43]

But the progressive educators were not entirely to blame. In retrospect it would appear that Dewey's main task was not to change a school but to create one. The major problem in this regard, of course, was the applicability of progressive education, and particularly Dewey's ideas. Though the two tasks are not completely different, their differences had profound consequences for the change process in American schools. With this thought in mind, it is possible to attribute the failure of the spirit of progressive education to take hold in the public school primarily to the fact that this distinction between creating a social organization and changing an ongoing one was not drawn and examined.[44]

The most significant aspect of this failure to promote the necessary revolutionary reforms (such as freeing the learner and teacher) that characterized the progressive spirit in actual practice was the progressive movement's unwitting acceptance of formal schooling[45] as the medium for the transmission of new and diverse forms of educational experiences.[46] Dewey certainly appreciated informal education, yet his strategy of reforming the traditional school bureaucracy was to correct it by informalizing it. This meant that the traditional school's massive knowledge transmission responsibilities and activities were not substantially diminished during this period.

In Cremin's view, we could not expect informal interactions from a class of inadequate knowledge transmitters:

> What the progressives did prescribe made inordinate demands on the teachers' time and ability. "Integrated studies" required familiarity with a fantastic range of knowledge and teaching materials; while the commitment to build up student needs and interests demanded extraordinary feats of pedagogical ingenuity. In the hands of first-rate innovators, the innovations worked wonders; in the hands of too many average teachers, however, they led to chaos.[47]

Given these difficulties in applying the fundamental principles of the progressive education doctrine, the content of the school curriculum changed, new learning activities and administrative reforms appeared, supervisory positions were created, what people said and talked about took on a different nature and quality—but life in the classroom did not change much, if at all.[48] One reason proposed by Silberman to explain why true progressive education reform was slow to develop and remained isolated and fragmented despite the successes of earlier experimental efforts is that progressive education "was vulgarized beyond recognition by teachers, principals, and superintendents who mouthed the rhetoric but understood neither the spirit nor the underlying theory."[49] Unfortunately, these failures left a void to be filled by those later referred to in educational circles as Neo-Progressives, who felt, along with others like Paul Goodman, that although progressive education and Deweyism had been misinterpreted and abused, all of those humanists among their numbers had been unforgivably shortchanged.

The Legacy of Paul Goodman: 1960 - 1972

(i) *Goodman as Guru and Guide to Dissenting Youth and Disenchanted Educators*

> The young are excellent, and there is nothing to do but love them.
>
> Nietzsche

> Goodman told home truths.
>
> Robert Meredith[50]

Against the backdrop of educational reform, particularly since the early sixties, the contribution of Paul Goodman glows conspicuously like a beacon in the pitch-black of night. One major reason is to be gleaned from Goodman's attack on schools and other social organizations connected with their operations for increasing the alienation of youth, rather than attempting to alleviate it. In assessing Goodman's strong reaction to the youth crisis accompanying social as well as educational developments in the sixties, Dennison has written:

> The radical thought (and action) of the '60's in the U.S. was really the broadening of a groundswell that began in the late '40's and grew larger in the '50's. There was a broad front of radical change, and the many people affected by it were affected in many ways. [Moreover], it affected everything from the arts to political thought to educational reform. Goodman was always an influential figure in this revaluation of values. His audience kept getting larger and his disciples more numerous. The effects of his thought can be found in anarchist and libertarian politics today, and in psychotherapy, and in community planning, and in what is called "alternate education".[51]

Personally as well as intellectually, then, the decade of the sixties was a fruitful period for Goodman and his ideas, and magnified his contributions to educational debates and educational thinking, rather than detracted from them. Viewed from a personal standpoint, he was a veritable Leviathan in educational circles, exuding such qualities in his makeup as simple dignity, quiet charm, and boyish honesty—qualities which frequently commanded the awe, respect, and attention of his academic peers. When these personal attributes combined with his clear-mindedness and cool intellectuality to advance reasoned arguments, many educators, particularly Neo-Progressives, were wooed, or at least deeply affected by Goodman and his appealing ideas. He strongly influenced their conceptions of formal schooling and the possibility of instituting educational alternatives. With such thoughts in mind, Robert Meredith has proposed:

> Goodman was the leading figure in a radical reform movement that spanned the 60's. By that I mean he provided the basic formulations later taken up and developed by such men as John Holt and Ivan Illich, both of whom were his friends. His impact was often through their work, as well as his own, particularly *Growing Up Absurd*.[52]

Moreover, Dennison further reinforces this claim by suggesting:

> Ivan Illich has been very deeply influenced by Goodman. So has the eastern wing of the Gestalt Therapy movement. Much of what I say in *The Lives of Children* comes from having known Paul and having been trained by him in psycho-therapy.[53]

Of course, while Goodman was adding to his popularity and appeal among academic circles, he was also intellectually seducing the youth with his telling barbs directed primarily at the dominant economic system and educational institutions in their societies, and by his revelations concerning the absurdities of living in twentieth century America. It is oftentimes difficult to speculate why one particular individual had an impact and influence on one particular group of individuals when he did. But the task of uncovering a rationale for Goodman's impact and influence on American youth provides us with a few exceptions to this general premise. Some educators, for example, surmise that the reason why Goodman became a kind of folk or cult hero to the youth was his ability to point to the oppressiveness and deep-seated anxiety inherent in living under the thumb of "Big Brother" in America, while at the same time refusing himself to "knuckle under" and "make do" inside a social system he despised, or become totally co-opted and corrupted by it. Additionally, it could be argued that students on college campuses who forgot about Goodman in distrusting people over 30 were reacting to Goodman's personal integrity, i.e., his willingness to live out, and, in many cases suffer and pay for, his life experiences, irrespective of the cultural mores of the present social order.[54]

George Dennison, arguing in similar vein, contends that Goodman's discovery by the youth and appeal within their ranks is connected to the timeliness of his advent on the political and social scene in America; he was a Guru when the youth desperately needed one:

> I think the basic reason for his popularity in the 60's was that he lived his thought; he wasn't an academic or an intellectual careerist. Our young people had come to distrust the careerism of their elders. They were hungry for thought that bore directly on life, that is on immediate moral choice and ethical or political action. Not many men can fill such a need. Paul could, and did, very brilliantly. His popularity with the young waned when they themselves gave way to mere rhetoric, i.e. gave way to a kind of careerism in political dissent. But during the year before his death, the young seemed to be turning to him again. He was joined to them in discontent. They were his favoured people for many reasons: sexual, his own liveliness and youthfulness, his sense of hope, etc.[55]

Unquestionably, Goodman's contribution to educational reform in America cannot be dissociated from his willingness to see everyday mundane problems clearly, and articulate his messages simply and concisely while providing alternatives to the individual's gloomy construct of his present reality.

(ii) *Goodman's Educational Posture vis-à-vis the Progressives and Neo-Progressives*

> Practical learning, in an atmosphere of free animal expression and freedom to fantasize, instead of the parson's morality and the schoolmaster's ruler, constituted the whole of Progressive Education.
>
> Paul Goodman, "From John Dewey to A. S. Neill," *Liberation*

> Yet my heart is still sore with disappointment of the paradise lost I could not enter.
>
> Paul Goodman, *Hawkweed*

As much as Goodman influenced and affected other educators, he in turn was drawn through empathy to the intellectual heritage of progressive education and the continuing concerns of Neo-Progressives[56] within the present social order, and herein lies another basis upon which to judge the rationale for, and outcome of, his contribution to educational reform and debate.

When reviewing the legacy of progressive education within the existing social order, and especially in present educational endeavours, Goodman argues in *Growing Up Absurd* that although the progressive education movement arose in response to specific historical and societal conditions, pedagogically speaking it was a missed or compromised revolution of unfulfilled prophesies, never completing its missions or realizing its ideals. Goodman lists this missed revolution and these unfulfilled prophesies, understood to accurately represent progressive educational theory in action, as follows:

> To learn theory by experiment and doing.
>
> To learn belonging by participation and self-rule.
>
> Permissiveness in all animal behaviour and interpersonal expression.
>
> Emphasis on individual differences.
>
> Unblocking and training feeling by plastic arts, eurhythmics, and dramatics.
>
> Tolerance of races, classes, and cultures.
>
> Group therapy as a means of solidarity, in the staff meeting and community meeting.
>
> Taking youth seriously as an age in itself.
>
> Community of youth and adults, minimizing "authority."
>
> Educational use of the actual physical plant (buildings and farms) and the culture of the school community.
>
> Emphasis in the curriculum on real problems of wider society, its geography and history, with actual participation in the neighbouring community (village or city).
>
> Trying for functional interrelation of activities.[57]

While attempting to promote these pedagogical ideals, the progressive education movement, Goodman proposes, operated according to the assumption that children were not being educated as well as they could be. In this sense he assesses the movement as a reaction to schooling that had become cramped and rigid. Moreover, its avowed purpose was supposedly to liberate what had been distorted or repressed in children's growing up,[58] and in expressions of their basic natures.

In Goodman's manner of thinking, the crux of the failure of these progressive education philosophies and ideals to take root in American society was not that these revolutionary ideals were unattainable, but that the progressive revolution in education was compromised, aborted, subverted, forgotten, or bureaucratized to the score that the entire progressive movement lost sight of its original intention and even its meaning. The revolution of progressive education, Goodman admonishes, was never given a chance to work as originally intended by its proponents: "It's ideas and methods have been stolen and bastardized precisely to strengthen the dominant system of society rather than to change it."[59]

Although Goodman is quick to admit that the progressive education movement did emphasize the education of the "whole person" and the use of "group experience," he is obviously dissatisfied because the original promise of the movement—the belief in preserving the naturalness of the child—did not come to fruition. Furthermore, he asserts, by way of example, that at least in the practicality of everyday experience its educational outcomes did not measure up to the spoken word: one of

Dewey's "mistakes" was to attempt to domesticate industrialization by "learning by doing" inside the schools.[60]

Because Goodman believed progressive education could not be dissociated from the progressive movement in the social and political fields, and that both of these movements were so inextricably intertwined that failure in one led to failure in the other, he is certain the failure of the progressive education revolution weakened the revolution for social justice, political freedom, and civil liberties within American society. Ironically, perhaps, the successes of progressive education are viewed as total failures in terms of widespread social gains for the whole of mankind, and towards the possible attainment of various kinds of social orders Dewey, Goodman, and others had foremost in mind. This was in large part because, in Goodman's opinion, the type of society that emerged in the generation following the progressive era did not measure up to the dreams of its educational visionaries.[61]

Quite often in his educational writings, Goodman appears to be confronting us with the question: what would happen if these historical revolutions, whether educational or otherwise, proved successful? In Goodman's view, the chaos, uncertainty, and even cynicism, which society has inherited as a result of these missed revolutions and unfulfilled prophesies would suddenly vanish. As far as education is concerned, if the failures and misses of progressive education were corrected, and its revolutionary ideals perfected and utilized, Goodman is confident that our societies would then offer individuals a better environment within which to grow up and become educated.[62] Childhood would be full of objective and worthwhile activities because youngsters would use and harmonize their unique powers, including their senses, to learn from real objects they could see and feel, not elusive abstractions. And finally, Goodman informs us that much of what he and many of the Neo-Progressives of late have advocated would be successfully effected: viz., a resurgence of progressivism in educational practice, not simply educational rhetoric, should subsequently occur. Here, of course, we may again catch an inkling of Goodman's desire, particularly through the power of his negative critique of formal schooling, and his formulating of alternatives to it, to merely heal the abuses of a progressive educational theory which he believed had been either heartlessly ignored or unforgiveably misunderstood in its practical applications within the present social order.[63]

The Neo-Progressive Revolt

> It is as if we were driving a multi-million dollar sports car, screaming, 'Faster, faster', while peering fixedly into the rear-view mirror. It is an awkward way to try to tell where we are, much less where we are going, and it has been sheer dumb luck that we have not smashed ourselves to bits—so far. We have paid almost exclusive attention to the car, equipping it with all sorts of fantastic gadgets and an engine that will propel it at ever-increasing speeds, but we seem to have forgotten where we wanted to go in it.
>
> Postman and Weingartner,
> *Teaching as a Subversive Activity*

During the middle sixties, a number of critics of education, aptly referred to as Neo-Progressives,[64] forced the American public to examine the progress of schooling as never before and consider educational changes that were fundamental and realistic for the time.[65] These educators, in sum, were mostly a diverse group of frustrated teachers, possessing no single voice, yet they shared a common anger and contempt directed primarily at the predominant educational and folk mythologies (e.g., equality of educational opportunity) discernible in the current rhetoric of school officials. The group's outcries (especially in spirit and tone), many educators felt, resembled the ghost of Dewey come alive in new form. Perhaps this was because they favoured a resurgence of Deweyan progressivism.

Along with Rousseau, Dewey and Goodman, the Neo-Progressives possessed a faith in the innate potential and capabilities of the young. They also remained true to the belief that "everything is good as it comes from the hands of the creator; everything degenerates in the hands of man." According to Holt, "nobody is stupid"; educators simply "encourage children to act stupidly."[66] Instead of making children absorb facts and ideas chosen previously, what was required was an education featuring a process of growth and development in which the potentialities of the child could develop naturally and freely in a healthy environment. A healthy environment in this instance was none other than the atmosphere offered by warm relationships between teacher and child, between child and child, and between school and society.[67]

In this manner, children could harness their own unique powers to learn from objects that they could see and touch, not meaningless abstractions. Children would influence the course of study which was presented to them, and thereby progress at their own rate. This rate the child set entirely himself, and was not to be determined by the average rate of progress of his peers.[68] The future task of educators, according to one proponent of the Neo-Progressive idea, is to

> . . . let every child be the planner, director and assessor of his own education, to allow and encourage him, with the inspiration and guidance of more experienced and expert people, and as much help as he asked for, to decide what he is to learn, when he is to learn it, how he is to learn it, and how well he is learning it. It would be to make our schools, instead of what they are, which is jails for children, into a resource for free and independent learning, which everyone in the community, of whatever age, could use as much or as little as he wanted.[69]

In such a learning set-up, therefore, it was hoped that the intrinsic rewards experienced by the learner would increase, while the necessity for applying extrinsic motivation would decrease.[70]

Neo-Progressivism as an educational movement also challenged all the fundamental premises of educational theory and practice which characterized the late sixties, and in this respect it flourished and grew popular on a wave of cynicism and negative criticism. The new critics inverted most of the accepted truths cherished by conventional educators such as Conant and Hutchins. In more specific terms, they opposed along with Goodman the belief that schools were helping to build a better social order (a view put forward by Theodore Brameld and others), alleging that schools perpetuate a sick and inhuman social order. In like manner to Goodman and Friedenberg, the Neo-Progressives also argued that school institutions stood as symbols of society's deep-rooted fear, hatred, and distrust of the young. Similarly, schools did not teach essential skills; they emphasized instead the learning of skills needed to beat the system.[71] In *How Children Learn*, John Holt remarks:

> Only a few children in school ever become good at learning in the way we try to make them learn. Most of them get humiliated, frightened, and discouraged. They use their minds, not to learn, but to get out of doing the things we tell them to do—to make them learn. In the short run, these strategies seem to work. They make it possible for many children to get through their schooling even though they learn very little. But in the long run these strategies are self-limiting and self-defeating, and destroy both character and intelligence. The children who use such strategies are prevented by them from growing into more than limited versions of the human beings they might have become. This is the real failure that takes place in school: hardly any children escape. . . .[72]

Therefore, it was not difficult for the Neo-Progressives to independently conclude that teaching and learning were all nigh impossible in the present bureaucratic school system. Discipline replaced worthwhile learning, and teaching and learning often interfered with meaningful human growth and development.

According to the Neo-Progressives, society does not need individuals adjusted to inhumane patterns of social organization, but individuals adjusted to and complete in themselves. Above all, they attacked educators for being too successful in achieving the purposes of an allegedly sick society (as did Friedenberg). In addition, the Neo-Progressives deplored the dehumanization, apathy and boredom prevalent in the North American classroom; they rejected the concern for educational accountability because of the emphasis given to objective, quantitative, and measurable sides of learning to the apparent exclusion of the subjective and the personal. Finally, they assailed the public school for bureaucratic inertia and an obsolescent preoccupation with trivia.

As we enter further into the decade of the seventies, the question most educators are addressing to the ghosts of Paul Goodman and John

Dewey, the Neo-Progressives, and more recently, Radical Humanists like Illich and Reimer, is whether any kind of educational movement can take root and lead towards a humanistic programme for children. Perhaps another question is whether the school system and its defenders will be successful once more in disarming these new critics through a strategy of compromise, outright assimilation, or defiant inaction.[73] Undoubtedly, the answer is partly to be gleaned primarily from the Neo-Progressive challenge to the current approach to formal schooling.[74] As an alternative solution to the present malfunctioning school system they suggest that a concerted effort should be made for a progressive restructuring of schools in the direction of launching a comprehensive reform in the structure and content of schooling. Moreover, the Neo-Progressives believe that schools can and should facilitate learning, teaching, and other educational experiences if only they could recover this function.

The massive Silberman study, *Crisis in the Classroom*, undertaken for the Carnegie Commission in 1970, for example, discovered that schools were "terrible" places where students indulged in mindless learning activities. Despite this 'startling' revelation, Silberman concluded that schools could continue without any major structural overhauls (e.g., schools needed more experimental innovation, a heightened sense of teacher purpose, etc.):

> If mindlessness is the central problem, the solution must lie in infusing the various educating institutions with purpose, more important, with thought about purpose, and about ways in which techniques, content, and organisation fulfill or alter purpose. . . . We must find ways of stimulating educators . . . to think about what they are doing and why they are doing it. And we must persuade the general public to do the same.[75]

If Silberman's solution for salvaging our schools is to be taken seriously, it appears that such practices as he foresees are tantamount to handing a few band-aid strips to a haemophiliac when he is bleeding to death. No one would deny that schools are offering new boxes (e.g., programmed instruction, continuous progress, engineered and open classrooms, etc.), but the contents of these packages are still the same. This cosmetic approach of adding a few new wrinkles to an old system is a sad reminder that abused and misinterpreted Deweyism is now dead and any attempts to revive its tattered corpse are less than futile.

Therefore, by attempting to change the entire school system from within, and not just one form (such as the school's failure to meet the needs of the poor and the alienated youth), or all of it, the Neo-Progressives are duplicating the Deweyan error of seeking to change a rigidly entrenched, ongoing system rather than create a new and vital one. If the schools are educating to the wrong ends, say the Neo-Progressives, we can change the ends by utilizing different means, viz., changing the behaviour of teachers and learners within the system. Naturally, such a solution places them in the comfortable position of both questioning what goes on in our present schools, and at the same time neglecting to question the idea of the desirability of retaining the school system itself.

Few educators would now dispute the fact that trying to institute educational innovations within the old school framework of bureaucracy and formalism is no longer valid. Unfortunately, previous progressive educators had to discover this fact the hard way. Maybe the

Neo-Progressive attempt to do the same thing is the reason why, despite their pounding away from disparate angles at a common theme, no single unifying set of their ideas has gained widespread acceptance. Therefore, the real danger is imminent that the entire Neo-Progressive movement, like that of its progressive predecessors, will be self-defeating as an ideology, educational philosophy, and perhaps even as an organizational system.

Nevertheless, the organizational impact of the new movement has already begun to surface, primarily because of the guiding light shown by prominent members from their number. For example, Jonathan Kozol, in Boston, made friends with students, took them on trips with him, visited their homes, and did not stress conventional (i.e., school) training.[76] Herbert Kohl, on the other hand, taught a sixth grade class in Harlem with a kind of freedom and spontaneity that motivated many of them to take an interest in their schooling.[77] Although these attempts at reform are sporadic at best, the period of the seventies promises to be a time of transition for educational developments in American society, most probably characterized by searching efforts by educators to articulate humanistic educational directions for the future. The Neo-Progressives could perhaps succeed in infusing a progressive spirit where Dewey and his followers have failed only if they can become the focal point of a much wider disaffected group of individuals who preach revolution, not reform. To ponder the alternatives if the new movement fails, however, requires a great deal more courage than most of us now possess.

Footnotes to Chapter V

[1] This chapter, then, could be viewed as a reflection of the writer's personal viewpoints concerning the progressive education reform movement, as well as his notions about the place of Goodman and his ideas within it.

[2] With this idea in mind, Lawrence Cremin quite justifiably places the progressive education movement in the burst of social and political reform called the Progressive Movement. See Cremin's *The Transformation of The School*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961, pp. 179-354.

[3] L. Cremin, *The Genius of American Education*, New York: Vintage Books, 1965, pp. 8-9.

[4] The idea that school was the greatest instrument ever created to build a good society and that its central purpose was to create among all a common faith, a sharp sense of common interest, and a love for a political order which served this faith and these interests is perhaps the major reason why schools have survived in American society for so long. Educators from Horace Mann to Dewey and James Bryant Conant have given this idea close consideration in their writings, and arguments over the feasibility of using schools for this purpose have spanned two or three generations of American educators.

[5] Quoted in W. Semple's "Education: Is it Serving the Person or the Market?", *Poundmaker*, Vol. 1, No. 26, April 4, 1973, pp. 9-10.

[6] J. Spring, "Education and Progressivism," *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 10, No. 1, Spring 1970, pp. 53-71.

[7] The basic tenets of this approach are outlined in D.W. Swift's *Ideology and Change in the Public Schools*, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Pub., 1971, pp. 11-30.

[8] M. Holmes, "A Critique of Neo-Progressive Trends in Canadian Education," *Interchange*, Vol. 2, No. 3, 1971, p. 65.

[9] R. Winn, (ed.), *John Dewey: Dictionary of Education*, New York: Philosophical Library, 1959, p. 121.

[10] J. Dewey, *The Child and the Curriculum*, Chicago: Phoenix Books, 1963, p. 11.

[11] Winn, *John Dewey: Dictionary of Education*, *op. cit.*, pp. 123-124.

[12] L.A. Cremin, "John Dewey and the Progressive Education Movement," in R.D. Archambault (ed.), *Dewey on Education—Appraisals*, New York: Random House, 1966, p. 17.

[13] J. Dewey, *The School and Society*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1915.

[14] E. Thorndike, *Educational Psychology*, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1910.

[15] R. Butts, and L. Cremin, *A History of Education in American Culture*, New York: Henry, Holt, and Co., 1953, p. 439.

[16] See, e.g., Kandel's *Conflicting Theories of Education*, New York: Macmillan Co., 1938; and, W. Bagley's *Education and Emergent Man*, New York: T. Nelson and Sons, 1934.

[17] See George S. Count's *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?*, New York: John Day Co., 1932.

[18] Cremin, *The Transformation of the School*, *op. cit.*, p. 328.

[19] See, e.g., Arthur Bestor's *Educational Wastelands* (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1953) and *The Restoration of Learning* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955); Max Rafferty's *Suffer, Little Children*, New York: Devin-Adair Co., 1962; Robert Hutchin's *The Conflict in Education*, New York: Harper Bros., 1953; H.G. Rickover's *Education and Freedom*, New York: E. Dutton and Co., 1959; Albert Lynd's *Quackery in the Public Schools*, Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1953; Paul Woodring's *Let's Talk Sense About Our Schools*, New York: McGraw Hill Co., 1953; Mortimer Smith's *The Diminished Mind*, Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1954; and, Rudolph Flesch's *Why Johnny Can't Read*, New York: Harper and Row, 1955.

[20] G. Gutek, *An Historical Introduction to American Education*, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1970, pp. 198-200.

[21] Cremin, *The Transformation of the School*, *op. cit.*, pp. 339-347.

[22] Gutek, *An Historical Introduction to American Education*, *op. cit.*, pp. 200-202.

[23] S. Sarason, *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971, pp. 10-20.

[24] Ironically perhaps, in 1969, when the United States placed a man on the moon, the schools received no credit for the achievement.

[25] See J. Conant, *The American High School Today: A First Report to Interested Citizens*, New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1959.

[26] S. Rippa, *Education in a Free Society: An American History*, New York: David McKay Co., 1971, pp. 197-200.

[27] J. Bruner, "After John Dewey, What?", *Saturday Review*, June 17, 1961, pp. 58-59; 76-78.

[28] J. Gardner, *Excellence, Can we be Equal Too?*, New York: Harper Books, 1961.

[29] J. Bruner, *The Process of Education*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1960.

[30] J. Conant, *Slums and Suburbs*, New York: McGraw Hill Co., 1961.

[31] N. Hentoff, *Our Children are Dying*, New York: Viking Press, 1966.

[32] J. Holt, *How Children Fail*, New York: Pitman Pub., 1964; J. Kozol, *Death at an Early Age*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967; and, C. Silberman, *Crisis in Black and White*, New York: Random House, 1964.

[33] See, e.g., J. Goodlad and R.H. Anderson, *The Nongraded Elementary School*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1963.

[34] See D. McDonald's "Youth," *The Centre Magazine*, Vol. 3, No. 4, July-August 1970, pp. 22-33.

[35] Correspondence with the writer dated September 27, 1973 (see Appendix II).

[36] R.E. Mason, *Contemporary Educational Theory*, New York: David McKay Co., 1972, p. 243.

[37] See, e.g., "About Paul Goodman," *New Schools Exchange Newsletter*, No. 82, September 15, 1972, p. 2 (Appendix II); and, Edgar Friedenberg's *Coming of Age in America: Growth and Acquiescence*, New York: Random House, 1965.

[38] B. Kaufman, *Up the Down Staircase*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1964.

[39] J. Spring, *Youth and the Custodial Role of the Schools*, Cuaderno, Mexico: CIDOC, No. 1011, 1970.

[40] E. Meyers, *Education in the Perspective of History*, New York: Harper and Row, 1960, p. 286.

[41] C. Greer, *The Great School Legend*, New York: Basic Books Inc., 1972, p. 73.

[42] J. Dewey, "A Centennial Review," in M. Dworkin (ed.), *Dewey on Education*, New York: Columbia University Teachers College, 1961, p. 14.

[43] Cremin, *The Transformation of the School*, *op. cit.*, pp. 134-135; 142.

[44] Sarason, *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change*, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-10.

[45] According to Willard Waller, "formalism is psychically cheap." See Waller's *The Sociology of Teaching*, New York: Russell and Russell, 1932, p. 433.

[46] This is nothing more than proving Toynbee's theory: "When a separate formal kind of education makes its appearance it brings into existence a new class of professional teachers who work, like other professional men and women, for pay." See Meyers, *Education in the Perspective of History*, *op. cit.*, p. 286.

[47] Cremin, *The Transformation of the School*, *op. cit.*, p. 348.

[48] H. Stevenson, R. Stamp, and J. Wilson, *The Best of Times, The Worst of Times*, Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972, pp. 454-456.

[49] C. Silberman, *Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education*, New York: Random House, 1970, p. 283.

[50] Correspondence with the writer dated September 4, 1973. Mr. Meredith is Chairman of the American Studies programme at the University of California at Davis. He was a close friend of Goodman's (see Appendix II).

[51] Correspondence with the writer dated July 12, 1973 (see Appendix II).

[52] Correspondence with the writer, *op. cit.*

[53] Correspondence with the writer, *op. cit.* See George Dennison's *The Lives of Children*, New York: Random House, 1969.

[54] P. Goodman, "Moral Youth in an Immoral Society," in Time, Inc., *The Young Americans*, New York: Time-Life Books, 1966, pp. 18-19; 110-111 (see Appendix II).

[55] Correspondence with the writer, *op. cit.*

[56] Of course, while he embraces much of the philosophical theories of Progressive and Neo-Progressive supporters, Goodman's views differ from theirs in two important respects: the freedom of the child with regard to his attendance or non-attendance at school, and the possibility of less authoritarian and bureaucratic roles for teachers. On both of these questions, Goodman is closer to the views expressed by Neill, than those of Holt or Dewey.

[57] P. Goodman, *Growing Up Absurd—Problems of Youth in the Organized Society*, New York: Vintage Books, 1960, pp. 81-82 (see Appendix I, item 14).

[58] P. Goodman, *New Reformation—Notes of a Neolithic Conservative*, New York: Random House, 1970, p. 81 (see Appendix I, item 33).

[59] P. Goodman, *The Community of Scholars*, New York: Random House, 1962, p. 211 (see Appendix I, item 17).

[60] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

[61] The striking similarity between Goodman's arguments in this respect, and those of the Neo-Progressives (which follow) cannot be understated.

[62] P. Goodman, *Kafka's Prayer*, New York: The Vanguard Press, 1947, pp. 130-131 (see Appendix I, item 6).

[63] P. Goodman, "From John Dewey to A. S. Neill," *Liberation*, Vol. 8, No. 9, November 1963, pp. 23-24 (see Appendix I, item 191).

[64] For a positive analysis of this group's contribution see D. A. Maciver's "The Tradition of the New Progressives," *Teacher Education*, No. 4, Spring 1971, pp. 56-57. For an opposing view see the article by M. Smith, "The Romantic Radicals—A Threat to Reform," in D. U. Levine and R. J. Havighurst (eds.), *Farewell to Schools???*, Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Pub. Co., 1972, pp. 72-77.

[65] M. Raywid, *The Axe-Grinders*, New York: Macmillan Co., 1962.

[66] B. and R. Gross, *Radical School Reform*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969, p. 539.

[67] Holmes, "A Critique of Neo-Progressive Trends in Canadian Education," *op. cit.*, pp. 63-66.

[68] Holt, *How Children Fail*, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

[69] J. Holt, *The Underachieving School*, New York: Pitman Pub. Co., 1969, p. 46.

[70] J. Holt, *How Children Learn*, New York: Dell Pub. Co., 1971, p. 155.

[71] K. Cross, *Beyond the Open Door*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Pub., 1971, p. 22.

[72] Holt, *How Children Learn*, *op. cit.*, pp. vii-viii.

[73] This question is further explored in the writer's conclusion to the study.

[74] Many of these proposals are outlined in Jordan Bishop's *Schools Under Fire: The Success and Failure of an Ideology: A Survey of Radical Critique of Education in the 60's*, Cuaderno, Mexico: CIDOC, No. 1015, 1971. For more representative statements of this position see, e.g., J. Holt, *Freedom and Beyond*, New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1972;

J. Herndon, *The Way its Spozed to Be*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1968; B. Schwartz, *Affirmative Education*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1972, and D. Stewart, *Educational Malpractices: The Big Gamble in Our Schools*, Westminster, California: Slate Services Pub., 1971.

[75] Silberman, *Crisis in the Classroom*, *op. cit.*, pp. 10-11.

[76] J. Kozol, *Death at an Early Age*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1967.

[77] H. Kohl, *36 Children*, New York: Signet Books, 1967.

Chapter VI

GOODMAN'S CRITIQUE OF FORMAL SCHOOLING: A PLEA FOR INCIDENTAL EDUCATION

> The people shape their schooling; thereafter schooling shapes the people.
>
> Winston Churchill (quoted by E. Hurwitz)

In providing us with a critique of the workings of formal pedagogical systems, Goodman offers as an alternative a panoramic view of an educational process, viz., incidental education, which is drawn from widely disparate perspectives. From the historical perspective, he outlines a process which he believes was in existence prior to the rise and development of formal pedagogy.[1] From the pedagogical perspective, he describes this process theoretically, in the sense that it is yet to be implemented or reinstated in its true form (e.g., Goodman believes progressive education, which appears remarkably similar to his incidental brand of education, was never put into effect).[2] Finally, from the psycho-social perspective, he provides us with a glimpse of the formal pedagogical system which, unfortunately, in his view, presently exists.[3] Understandably, Goodman bases or bolsters his critique primarily on the latter perspective, although he is quick to make comparisons between the benefits that might accrue from an educational process which once successfully functioned throughout history, and could perhaps do so again in the future, and the restraints imposed by the existing formal pedagogical structures.

At closer examination, however, it is soon apparent that Goodman's view of how man or man's nature can become and was at one time is synonymous with his ideal of what education can become and was in the past.[4] Moreover, how the formal pedagogical system presently exists is, regrettably, according to Goodman, what man or man's nature is and is likely to continue to be unless he can change it.[5] Therefore, Goodman is only interested in the formation and implementation of an educational process or series of learning arrangements for the extent to which they can both preserve or release the developing nature of man and enable him to become what he could become. It is the precise nature and content of this linkage of the writer's conception of Goodman's views on human nature with his educational proposals that the writer wishes to acknowledge is Goodman's contribution to education reform, and the main thrust and argument of this thesis.

In the above as well as in most respects, Goodman is less interested in learning (which he envisages as only a part of the growth process) than in growth, dignity, autonomy, and the development of the full range of human potentialities he suggests provide the makeup for an individual's basic nature. His idealized conception of human nature enables him to reject man as he is or is likely to remain, and welcome man as he is becoming or could be, if given the chance. Similarly, in taking this position, Goodman feels compelled to reject institutions (especially formal pedagogical ones) as they are, and to pay more attention to institutions as they are becoming or ought to be, primarily because of the important role they play in shaping his ideal version of man. Quite often, in Goodman's vision, man and his institutions as they are becoming and could be closely mirror man and his institutions as they once were, and at this point in his argument Goodman merely wants to resurrect from the past many of those ideal forms that should be conserved or preserved enabling future man to thrive.

According to Goodman, education plays no small part in this scheme and in the realization of man's full potential. The aim of the incidental process of education Goodman has in mind is to provide man with exciting opportunities or enticing possibilities within his natural environment to engage in experiences necessary to promote his continuing growth and development to a stage where he can reveal his true nature.[6] However, it is not enough, in Goodman's view, that education and growing up (which require the judicious use of man's institutions and the release of man's true nature) anticipate man's potential human nature, they must predict what the social order of the future should or could be, and thereby help to create it.

On the other hand, Goodman is optimistic enough to surmise that man's developing nature will overcome the "perilous" state of the present social order (of which the formal pedagogical system is a part) in any case. These ideals, in accordance with Goodman's idealized conception of humanity, if realized, will lead to a better possible state for mankind, and the entire destiny and improved future condition of man will be attained.[7]

The Historical Perspective: Man as he Was

> My grandmother wanted me to have an education so she kept me out of school.
>
> Margaret Mead

> I took a great deal of pains with his eddication, sir; let him run in the streets when he was young, and shift for his-self. It's the only way to make a boy sharp.
>
> Charles Dickens, *Pickwick Papers*, (1836), Chapter 20. (Spoken by Sam Weller's father.)

In his historical treatment of the rise and development of a formal pedagogical system at the expense of an incidental process of education which he is convinced existed in the past, Goodman is not only inspired by an idealized version of a style of education that was once embraced by the mass of the community, but also by a kind of individual who he believes lived in the past and has now slipped dramatically from our grasp.

Goodman recalls that, until the twentieth century, most of the education of children occurred incidentally and naturally with learning taking place without, or apart from, schools. He contends that in 1900 in the United States, for example, only 6% of the eligible school-age population completed high school, and 1/4% college.[8] Up to this time, in many parts of the world, children were not taught formally, but learned by socializing with their peers in the community, with their families, or by community-labour, master-apprenticeships, games and religious initiations.[9] Under the informal tutelage and advice of such stable institutions as the family, the farm, the village, the church, and the craft guilds, the ordinary young person served his apprenticeship for living and was able to perfect his given nature in a friendly, warm environment. It is only a recent phenomenon, then, that schools have begun to intervene and replace previous ideas concerning the child's "natural" development and learning at the expense of the child's personal, more crucial and vital ones.

The march of history, Goodman proposes, is totally opposed to the notion of enforced intervention in the child's shaping of his own nature, including his learning activities, which are said to assist or promote its growth and development. For this reason, Goodman proposes that incidental education is better and more historically grounded and proven than formal pedagogy: there is no intervention and the child motivates himself intrinsically.[10]

According to Goodman, the primary community was historically man's finest educator: he learned what was necessary to grow and develop within the whole community, the whole society in which he lived. At this point in time there were many and various alternatives for growing up in a learning environment depending on the individual's chances, conditions of life and luck. He learned the skills, conventions, the minimum stereotyped responses—but he never stopped learning or growing as a person. Roving freely, interacting directly with his environment, the individual went on learning and changing all life long, attempting to release and conserve the animal nature with which he had been naturally endowed.[11] Therefore, as envisaged by Goodman, this individual has no job except education, a fact Thoreau also revealed when he pointed to the American Indian as the perfect lifelong learner.

This kind of individual Goodman has sometimes vividly described was also securely and firmly linked to a schedule of positive, intrinsic reinforcements—subtle, specific and precise. He planned; he manoeuvred in concert with his peers and elders, and he used all his senses and inner powers. He grew wise with age like the eternal sage. The consequences of, and moral responsibilities for, his acts were reasonably clear. There was little or no conflict between his private impulses and actions which might benefit the general good. No complex battery of punishments, artificially imposed by society, was deemed necessary or justified.[12]

During the last century this picture of man, which Goodman evinces to be desirable, was to change radically. He surmises that the rise of Industrial Society with its accompanying organizational structures witnessed the decline of the primary community, and the rise of less personalistic, more formalistic styles of living and learning, where the majority of children were educated in schools and colleges, and a major part of living (3 to 22 years) became an isolated aspect of formal schooling.[13] Any of the child's other interests, whether real or imaginary, had to be rudely interrupted to make way for formal school activities. Schools in this situation attempted to impose on 100% of the school-age population one established path for growing up.[14] During the past few decades, Goodman notes that the extension of formal schooling into adolescence and beyond has resulted in growing periods such as childhood and adolescence becoming instituted in schools. Furthermore, Goodman proposes that the real motivation for a five year old's behaviour is geared, in a majority of cases, 15 years into a more or less remote, but nonetheless predictable future.[15]

Given (in Goodman's view) the often overexaggerated and dominant role of schools in the new industrial age, even the institutions in which youth formerly learned incidentally such things, for example, as the catechism and identity rites from elders, nurses and pedagogues in youth houses or elsewhere, gave way to formal school institutions. Therefore, Goodman concludes that today, the process of formal schooling has surreptitiously taken over or overtly usurped the natural educational functions of most other institutions and that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to acquire an education outside of the institutionalized schooling process, owing to the monopolistic hold schools have on the educating function.[16] The schools are accused of thwarting alternative forms of growing up and developing an individual's true nature, by intervening and imposing their own ideas concerning the composition and direction of his "normal" growth. They are additionally charged with placing unfair and unrealistic constraints on a person's time and personal living space. Moreover, to leave school and seek elsewhere to grow up, Goodman asserts, is now regarded as a sign of eccentricity, failure, or delinquency.[17]

Despite the fact that he has, on more than one occasion, acknowledged the prevailing influence of formal pedagogy within the present society, Goodman is sure that his model of incidental education which stands as a symbol of what man once stood for may yet again determine in the present and imminent future what he may again become and is becoming, as well as perhaps overcome his existing chained condition. If this is the case, Goodman is confident man's potential nature will not only prosper and grow, but also that society will achieve new heights of creativity from the formation of a new social order.[18]

The Pedagogical Perspective: Man as he Could Become

> There are two irreconcilable possibilities: one, that man should be educated to become what he is; the other, that he should be educated to become what he is not.
>
> Sir Herbert Read, in *Education Through Art*

> If your plan is for one year, plant rice;
> For ten years, plant trees;
> For a hundred years, educate man.
>
> Confucius

From the pedagogical perspective, the crux of Goodman's argument against formal schooling is that a dire need exists in our present societies to implement an incidental process of education (somewhat reminiscent of that which occurred in the past and of "true" progressive education) so that man can become dramatically different from what he is now: he will become what he can become. Whether rightly or wrongly, Goodman has adequately underscored in a number of books and articles the benefits that may accrue to the individual through incidental inquiry. Left with their own developing natures and to their natural devices for seeking things out within the incidental processes, individuals are attributed the capacity to find their own paths to growing up and learning. Similarly, any learning arrangements in which the young participate are presumed to naturally and inevitably enable them to develop the full range of human potentialities that will produce Goodman's ideal man. In this respect his incidental scheme seems only the educational outcome or extension of providing individuals with an exciting, enticing environment that activates unique aspects of their developing natures.

To parallel the differences in nature between man's future and existing states of growth and development (and man's potential and repressed nature), Goodman points to the differences in approach and emphasis (especially with respect to methodology and content) between incidental education and direct pedagogical activity (i.e., formal schooling).

In order to aid the progress of his idealized version of man, Goodman proposes a style of incidental education that is supposedly not different or divorced from life and something that happens in school. It involves a process of absorbing ordinary social activities because all of society or the whole environment is said by Goodman to possess educative value. As defined by Goodman, incidental education is (roughly speaking) a community-style action, occurring naturally and inevitably, simply because individuals are permitted to grow up and become educated without pressure, by associating with their peers and elders, and growing into their institutions.[19]

Because every aspect of life and learning is inextricably intertwined or related, and all things are observed or experienced in unity, incorporated within their natural setting, life's procedures are learned in a manner more intense, more meaningful and more informal than would seem possible or plausible in a formal institution. In this respect, incidental education suits the nature of learning and living better than formal teaching: it offers opportunities for wholeness, diversity and deep involvement. The young can choose freely from the entire community and its alternative activities and resources those things that may help perfect their own future growth in particular, and that of future man in general.

Further, in Goodman's incidental scheme, when children and adults participate casually and willingly in incidental activities, there is, in his opinion, no anxiety enforced or imposed. His rationale for believing this is the notion that more and better learning takes place when activities are unplanned and spontaneous. Moreover, the necessity for extrinsic motivation becomes questionable, if unnecessary, as the intrinsic rewards increase.[20] The only planning involved is when the role of "teacher" shifts to the learner who sets his own tasks, selects his own reinforcement schedules, and supervises his own learning progress.[21] As Goodman has revealed, for this to happen there is and must be a reaching from within, as learning (and indeed all growing activities) becomes "second nature."[22] The community learner chooses or determines his own paths to growing up or to knowledge and certain skills he requires. Therefore, the incidental education process as outlined by Goodman is not only an education based upon need, desire, choice and opportunities for trying out, but also an education whereby the individual discovers his true nature without pressure or passivity, in a manner commensurate with his own inclinations or whims of the moment.

On the other hand, with respect to the formal pedagogical activities which are presumed to have brought about man's existing condition, Goodman argues that "education" (he is doubtful whether in fact it takes place in schools) is different and separate from life and said to occur in schools. Teachers directly impart what is not clearly evident in ordinary affairs. This includes knowledge that is often abstract, intangible and mysterious. Goodman therefore defines formal pedagogical activities and exercises as processes or procedures in which adults are involved in teaching by deliberate intervention and intentional socialization working from school principles which crystallize the social wisdoms and treasured knowledge of the most recent past and the principles, morals and habits reflected in the culture.[23] Under the guise of meeting the needs of present society and the culture, there is training for every occupation, as well as citizenship and sexuality. In Goodman's assessment, this "unwarranted intervention" is in large part the reason for man's existing condition: individuals are inhibited in their personal adjustments to society and the culture, and thus prevented from imbibing useful experiences which might aid their growth and development.

Because he is assured that formal school activities bear little relationship to real living or the child's developing nature (although he has said they do correlate nicely with man's situation as it presently exists), Goodman, in opposing formal pedagogy in schools, proposes that schools present only a minor aspect of what education (and hence, man) can and could become in the growing lives of children (and thereby inhibiting what they and man can become), despite the efforts of educators to bring back "experiences" into the classroom, and fit "educational" tasks and activities to suit the measure of the child's needs and interests.[24] In fact, Goodman has alternately stressed that, in many cases, organizational changes attempted within schools have merely served to institute the same conditions they sought to modify. For example, Goodman has determined that when educators were cognizant of alienation creeping into classrooms as a result of the formal schooling process, they attempted to extend and intensify formal schooling to cure it.[25] Therefore, this unfortunate aspect of man's present dilemma only increased.

In response to claims made by educators that organizational changes have indeed occurred within formal schools, Goodman is adamant that the real danger or possibility exists that the formalistic and symbolic structures which have arisen as a result of the successful imposition of the schooling process have become the exclusive end of all activity, in which no animal satisfaction is allowed or acknowledged, and in which there can be no personal satisfaction either—other than that channelled or defined by a teacher and redefined as the child's own.[26] In posing such a view, Goodman has suggested:

> (The) greatest waste of ability, including intellectual and creative ability, occurs because a playful, hunting, sexy, dreamy, combative, passionate, artistic, manipulative, and destructive, jealous and magnanimous, selfish and disinterested animal is constantly thwarted by social organisation and perhaps especially by schooling.[27]

Additionally, Goodman believes, because he is assured that all learning (and particularly incidental learning) relies for its impetus on inward motivation, rather than an adherence to external commands (and hence is more methodologically sound), that it is stupid to decide *a priori* what the young ought to know (i.e., what knowledge is of most worth) and then try to "motivate" them or "promote" their development.[28] This practice, according to Goodman, is not judicious anticipation, but unwarranted intervention. The learner is under personal pressure to perform successfully by external stimuli (e.g., rewards, praise, punishments, induced fear, the notion that what the learner is doing is in his own best "interests). Such approaches to learning endeavours has led Goodman to conclude, in a manner similar to Jules Henry, that attempts at formal teaching, either to provide "motivation" or experiences functional to the child's intrinsic needs can and have been positively harmful.[29] The present condition of man, Goodman has revealed, is a product of such approaches.

By citing one instance of a style of learning that is not opposed or harmful to the child's intrinsic needs and interests, Goodman attempts to remind us that children learn to speak fluently where no formal attempt is made to teach them, simply because learning occurs in an environment where there is speaking and where they are addressed and take part. On the other hand, Goodman has written that the teaching of reading often seems to prevent the learning of reading, and except for a minority of cases it results in the development of superficial reading skills and wooden writing.[30]

Goodman also assumes that many people who really learned to read and write well did so not by being taught during their formative years at school; they learned to read, for example, with their own books at their own pace and according to their own interests and needs at a later date. In this context, Goodman proposes that if we were to ask an individual where he developed an interest in reading he would more often than not give credit to the school, but in most cases he would freely admit after continual questioning that he acquired the skill outside of school.[31] To resolve dilemmas such as this, Goodman wants to extend learning such things as, e.g., reading, writing and calculating to the realm of incidental inquiry (as is speaking). If this situation arose, he is certain most normal children, devoid of an impoverished milieu, would probably pick up the reading and writing code by the age of 9 or 10 anyway, without formal instruction.[32]

In seeking to juxtapose the benefits of incidental learning with the disadvantages of formal schooling, Goodman warns that we should guard against such contradictions arising in our societies and schools as, for example, formally teaching a foreign language to individuals who, if allowed to visit a foreign country, can merely socialize with other people there and with no formal instruction learn a new language in 2 to 3 months. The trouble begins, Goodman says, when instruction commences or is even attempted. Concomitantly, Goodman feels that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to "teach" the social sciences, literary criticism, philosophy and other aspects of culture to youngsters who have had no responsible experience (e.g., community work) in life and society.

With respect to the disadvantages of formal pedagogy, Goodman stresses that it is not necessary to spend up to fifteen years training someone for a wide range of human activities (e.g., social work, office or factory employment, architecture, etc.) which are only remotely related to the academic.[33] He has also presented evidence which tries to prove that there is little or no correlation between a person's intellectual competency and years of prior schooling, or his employment suitability and level of schooling.[34] As Goodman wryly puts it: "Naturally, if diplomas are pre-requisite to hiring a youngster, the correlation of schooling and employment is self-proving."[35] Clearly, Goodman strongly believes that all of these brief, but widely disparate examples he has uncovered at one time or another provide sufficient ammunition to explode the myth that education is something cumulative (which takes place in graded steps in schools), routine (where tasks or activities advance through the same or successive phases for all children), and a process divorced from the on-going affairs of life or the intrinsic needs and interests of the child.[36] As he sees it, this kind of "education" results in piecemeal learning (in packages) to which only the blueprint mind would be accustomed.

In his attack on formal schooling from the pedagogical point of view, Goodman is enamoured by an image of what education can become and this image is closely tied to his idealized vision of what man can become. If man is able to implement the style of incidental education (this process being similar in approach and emphasis to education as he conceived it in the past and *"bona fide"* progressive education) which Goodman believes to be natural and inevitable and related to, and even part of, the experiences of an individual's growing up into life's activities, he is sure that it will serve the purpose not of training children with reference to their success in the present state of society (which is reflected in the existing pedagogical structure), but to a better possible state, in accordance with Goodman's ideal conception of humanity. By so doing, man will improve his own lot and that of his fellows and mankind.

The Social-Psychological Perspective: Man as he Is

> I take it that no man is educated who has never dallied with the thought of suicide.
>
> William James, *Letters*, ii, 39 (1896)

> And then the whining school-boy, with his satchel
> And shining morning face, creeping like snail
> Unwillingly to school.
>
> Shakespeare, *As You Like It*

Goodman's major quarrel with formal pedagogy from the social-psychological point of view is that what goes on in schools socializes each new generation to the dominant society and the available culture as it is presently perceived.[37] Thus, formal schools and colleges are tightly involved with the performance and even more with the style, of the dominant system of society and of the culture. As children grow up and develop, they are forced to make a deliberate and complicated adjustment to the existing society and culture (which in Goodman's view offers only an unhealthy environment) and that is why Goodman believes man is the way he is now. This process, according to Goodman, denies man the essential freedom of growing up and developing under his own auspices.[38] Moreover, how and what individuals are to grow up and develop to is regarded by Goodman as becoming increasingly rigidified, stratified, and cut and dried.[39] Goodman believes they have little choice in this matter, because the formal pedagogical system, under the guise of "socializing" individuals to the ways of society and to the culture, possesses a monopoly on this function, imposing on all youth one path for growing up and developing.[40]

One conclusion Goodman draws from this argument—a conclusion which may seem a familiar theme to followers of Goodman's writings—is that formal schooling justifies weakening certain human faculties in the young in the interest of strengthening others of use to the existing society:

> If we set up a structure which strictly channels energy, directs attention, and regulates movement, we may temporarily inhibit impulse, wishing, day-dreaming, and randomness; but also jeopardize initiative, intrinsic motivation, imagination, invention, self-reliance, freedom from inhibition, and finally even health and common sense.[41]

Goodman therefore attacks formal schools for their biscuit-cutter method of imprinting on children what he would term a crude and useless pattern of adjustment, particularly because it cuts all the threads and all the fibres of rich inner life that give rise to the child's uninterrupted growth, although it results in neat, uniform, and repetitious forms or patterns of men (resembling man as he is today). In this respect, Goodman views the schools as serving the goals of an unhealthy social order and not the human purposes towards which education is presumably directed.[42] The products of formal schooling are therefore not, in Goodman's opinion, inventiveness, flexibility, resourcefulness, curiosity, and judgement, in keeping with his idealized version of man, but stupidity, ignorance, incompetence, self-contempt, alienation, apathy, powerlessness, resentment and rage—the kind of components upon which the present society and its culture, including man himself, successfully functions and perpetuates itself.[43]

Having this aspect of man's functioning at the forefront of his thinking, Goodman is critical of schools for losing sight of what he evinces to be the real purpose or need of educational undertakings, i.e., the facilitation of the unimpeded growth and development of individuals in a warm, growth-promoting environment. For similar reasons, Goodman expresses regret that there is so little scope in present society for man to perfect his own nature and take part in activities that may not only produce or give rise to a new kind of man but also improve the present and future social order. If the individual is denied this scope, how can he, Goodman asks, be qualified to keep up and if possible raise the improvements that have already been attained by mankind?

As one example of the form of socialization or adjustment he is referring to and of the situation which now mirrors the existing condition of man, Goodman suggests that youth are forced to conform to the group norms and mass-produced values and responses reflected in formal school processes (and representative of the wider society and the culture). Everything that occurs in formal schools, according to Goodman, has an accent on the preparation of individuals for society and the culture as it is and there is little emphasis on, or regard for, such goals as, e.g., realization and satisfaction for the individual himself—healthy signals that growth is proceeding as it should. When these goals are inaccessible to individuals, and the manner of attaining them too involved, and not sufficiently at hand, it does not take too long, Goodman surmises, before individuals become too easily discouraged from, and interrupted by, formal schooling in their spontaneous learning experiences and other activities related to growing up.[44]

One reason Goodman advances for the occurrence of this situation is that the means of initiative, community-action and decision-making have been preempted by those in power in the formal school system.[45] Therefore, Goodman is opposed to the idea of handing over the problems of adjustment to authority figures as representatives of the present society, namely, the formal schools. Here he accuses formal schooling of attempting to resolve, by a process of enforced intervention or imposed relevance (where something is said to be in a person's best interests) all crises and conflicts for the young so that they possess or retain little sense of initiative, imagination, or causality, and are discouraged in their seeking to acquire any skills or personal qualities beyond those deemed necessary by the school curriculum. Moreover, such interventions or impositions which attempt, in his evaluation, to isolate individuals from the problems of society and the conflicts and tensions of ordinary existence by compulsorily placing them in schools results in these problems or conflicts being falsely or artificially resolved—not in the true sense, by which individuals in working out their own problems learn more and grow to be better. By so doing, the developing natures of the young (and present man) become primarily a product of, or a result of, the formal schooling process.

Particularly under the banner of imposed relevance, formal schools, by forcibly intervening in the child's growth and development and uninterrupted adjustment to his environment, have in Goodman's view redefined the stages of an individual's growing up and development in their own, rather than in his terms or interests, and have sought to shape his desires and tastes so as to make them its own.[46] Important growth or developmental characteristics previously attained outside of schools (e.g., permissiveness and sexual freedom) in a situation of the individual's free interplay with others in his environment are now heartlessly ignored or excluded in school undertakings and often defined or even redefined in formal school terms (e.g., as adolescent dating or courting).[47] Providing us with various instances, Goodman asserts that merit is regarded as a quirk or trait of personality, learning is viewed as the possession or acquisition of a diploma, usefulness is the achievement of a societal union card, initiative or creativity is getting the highest marks in tests, and cooperation is "belonging" and the ability to socialize. Moreover, the purpose of learning such important skills as reading is no longer for illumination or enlightenment, personal edification, clarification, appreciation, or the celebration of awareness within a community, but "functional literacy," the ability to follow directions and be employable.[48]

A secondary, and concomitant aspect of Goodman's first concern regarding the adaptation of individuals to the present society and its culture is that the formal process of schooling motivates the young to accept the inevitable fact that their present lives and most of the remainder of their lives after they depart from its institutions will almost entirely be dominated by social needs (i.e., fulfilling economic roles), rather than personal ones.[49] Thus, Goodman depicts the formal schools as bureaucratic organizations favouring abstractions and systemmatic, packaged necessities (i.e., acceptable attitudes, marketable skills, licenses and diplomas) over personal growth and human thoughts and feelings. Because of this emphasis, Goodman believes the schools to be ultimately responsible to a bureaucratic, welfare-oriented, state that demands recruits and obedient citizens to make it function. According to this view, society is conceived as a controlled system of personnel and transactions, and the schools are reported to be the teaching machine of all personnel. (Goodman often referred to this system as a form of universal social engineering.)[50]

Geared to the ends Goodman envisions, direct teaching in formal schools tries to give psychological preparation in depth (i.e., it imposes a hidden curriculum), intervening in the important process of growing up (schooling becoming its chief activity) because schooling for economic roles and norms takes up to 20 years. Even those individuals not required for academic work (all but a few percent) have their economic desires and tastes shaped by the school system—another example of imposed relevance. The policing of individuals and job training for fitting people into economic niches Goodman sees as central to this school policy.[51]

Because of what Goodman has described as the pervasiveness of the social needs ideology, individuals in schools are depicted as having little choice or opportunity to operate in any alternative, unauthorized manner outside the business of the school (and the present societal) enterprise. They have ceased to be personally engaged in the school operations or functions at all—in fact, their personal feelings and actions are only of incidental significance within the formal school structure.[52] Such arguments have led Goodman to attack individuals such as Conant for seeing education as a kind of "training ground" for the demands that the society and its culture make:

> It is in the schools . . . that the mass of our citizens in all classes learn that life is inevitably routine, depersonalized, venally graded; that it is best to toe the mark and shut up; that there is no place for spontaneity, open sexuality, free spirit. Trained in the schools, they go on to the same quality of jobs, culture, politics. This is education, mis-education, socializing to the national norms and regimenting to the national "needs".[53]

Faced with this predicament, Goodman concludes that the schools at any one point in time will perfectly (and unquestioningly so) reflect the society which gave rise to them and the outlook of the individuals who comprise the society. Moreover, the existing society is said to acquire the schools it deserves.[54]

As a corollary to his primary concerns with respect to the individual's adaptation to the present society and its culture, Goodman has also argued, because the schools have lost their human function, that the process of schooling expands, meaninglessly, for its own sake and self-aggrandizement (which happen to correspond with the goals of present society and the culture). The image Goodman often wishes to portray here is that of the school proceeding in its operations like a car without a driver at the steering wheel. To extend this analogy further, he contends that the absence of a driver indicates the incidental significance of the child's uninterrupted growth and development in the formal school programmes. Therefore, in his view, the schools have become a commitment looking for a reason, or a rationalization for its functioning. (Goodman was cognizant of what he termed school administrators' "sensitivity" to criticism and honest debate.)

Any attempt at the schools' imposing an order in the face of trying to provide themselves with a rationale (e.g., "social need," socialization, adaptation to the culture) for their functioning, creates, as Goodman sees it, an emptiness of function, a waste of time, and finally, chaos. Unable to recover their real purpose (i.e., the facilitation of unimpeded growth and development) or uncover such a rationale, Goodman suggests that schools are hollow institutions displaying a mindlessness, a form of self-delusion, and self-righteousness about the kinds of activities and worth of enterprises conducted inside their walls. Because Goodman is convinced such duplicity exists about the humaneness of their activities, especially in regard to their provision of "free growing" environments, he argues that administrators and other "schoolmen," in response to large-scale disenchantment or cries for reform of the formal schools: refine the school processing to make the curriculum still more "relevant," enrich the curriculum, add remedial steps, study developmental psychology for new points of manipulation, start school earlier, devise new teaching tasks and educational technologies, and seek to eliminate friction by admitting students to administrative functions. Such a situation Goodman roundly condemns.[55]

In advancing his critique of the present formal school system from the social-psychological vantage point, what appears to bother Goodman most of all is that such interventions or impositions made by formal schools (Goodman has referred to these variously as structuring, manipulation, and fragmentation), under the pretence of socializing individuals to the existing society and its culture, will result in the young distrusting their inner powers (which encourage an individual's growth and development), as if these processes are incapable of regulation by themselves alone. They will, instead, internalize or identify with external commands and be inhibited in any of their further dealings with these processes:[56]

> Children are inevitably caught in this kind of situation. Powerless and ignorant, they are subject to demands by big and knowing authorities who do not win their trust and assent, but against whom they cannot quit and against whom they cannot rebel. Matters become worse when the satisfaction of many of the child's desires, whether narcissistic, erotic, or ambitious, is further made impossible by fear, guilt, shame, and deprivation. The child is soon out of touch with what he needs, and he is shaky even about what he thinks he wants. Therefore, in a crisis, he easily gives up the content of his own wish and identifies with the wishes of authorities. He is then safe, blameless, and even boastful.[57]

Similarly, because he feels the young are unaware of the existence of viable alternatives outside the school environment, or have been prevented from exploring them, Goodman proposes that they are perhaps confused about the relevance of their own experiences and feelings or blocked from activities conducive to adequate growing up, so that they cling to their only security—the existing path they know best.

Perhaps more unfortunately, in Goodman's view, such interventions within the individual's environment will not only serve to weaken his sense that there is a world, a nature of things that has meaning, but also that human nature (including his own nature) is malleable, and that spontaneity and creativity can be controlled and shaped under the guise of what is socially and culturally relevant or desirable. It may also suggest that the world is not his, or belongs to others, and that he is powerless to change this situation. The social and psychological repercussions which could grow from these feelings, especially with respect to the development of a new man and a new order, are, as far as Goodman is concerned, of immense importance to future generations and to mankind.

Implications and Consequences of Goodman's Critique of Schooling: Man and the Educational Process as it Was

One implication that stands out above all in Goodman's treatment of an incidental educational process which he contends existed in the past is his belief that our society and its culture may have to rediscover the ways and means by which man lived and grew in the past (when education was a major factor) as well as seek to produce a new man from a new style of education which is yet to be accepted or rediscovered (e.g., progressive education). Because he believes that the past provided sufficient opportunities for the young, Goodman wants to recover this sense of loss and feeling of worth about past incidental activities and past forms of educating. This would be nothing more than putting the youth in communication with old activities that have proven effective in the past, and perhaps updating or upgrading them somewhat to produce new forms (e.g., the little red schoolhouse is to some extent Goodman's mini-school; medieval universities and colleges are Goodman's modern-day reconception pertinent to the creation of an educational scheme that will give rise to his new man and new order). Therefore, on the one hand, Goodman sees the possibility of catching up, preserving, or conserving what has been lost, and, on the other, the possibility of experimenting with and introducing new forms (much of which, like his community of scholars, resembled the old).[58]

The policy which Goodman has devised to blend the old and the new is referred to by him as restoring the right proportions.[59] By this he means simply tailor-making the interplay of the individual with his environment, presumably by keeping the units of human service (both human and material) smaller, as they existed prior to the growth and development of organized schooling, thus providing opportunities for the individual to "draw out" his inner powers, not fit him to the present society and its culture (e.g., to a useless technology). A new order would therefore arise not only because the individual would achieve a sense of his community or a love for and pride in his culture and civilization, aspects of which he would retain, but also because he might attain a feeling of personal responsibility and commitment in his dealings with others.

Implications and Consequences of Goodman's Critique of Schooling: Man and the Educational Process as it Could Become

Goodman's idealized account of an educational process (like progressivism) that is yet to be accepted and implemented or rediscovered closely mirrors his image of a desirable type of individual who is on the verge of being created for the future. One important practical implication of this idea is that man's nature will improve if we merely offer him an enticing environment or a society and a culture (including an incidental education process) which provides him with opportunities for uninterrupted growth and development. Man would then develop and perfect his natural faculties rather than stunt them. Moreover, he would ennoble what is natural in life (including his own functioning) and secure for it new strength in the new order which is soon to be created. If man can achieve this, the new order about which Goodman expresses such a strong faith can be achieved.

Another important consequence of this view is that children, freed from the process of formal schooling, would be able to use their spontaneity, initiative, imagination, and awareness, and gain intellectually, according to their interests. They would also be free to imitate, identify, be approved, or disapproved, co-operate and compete, or could socialize without fear, resentment, pressure, and passivity.[60] Therefore, the purpose of growing up and education would be to counteract and delay socialization or adaptation to society and its culture as long as possible. The young would then learn (following Jefferson's prescriptions) to multiply the sources and capacity for initiative in society, and would be makers of society not placid adjusters to it. On the one hand, children would be able to grow and develop unimpeded by authoritarian controls. In this manner, they would directly, and without any blurring of their goals or purposes, activate their own growth and development processes as quickly as possible.[61] On the other, they would free the unused, cramped powers that have been lying dormant (because of repression in the existing social order), and are waiting to be unleashed, to heal what Goodman has termed "bad" growth. Children are therefore not taught, but allowed to discover, learn, grow, and develop.

A second consequence, requisite for, or dependent upon, the introduction of an incidental process of education is that schools would, in Goodman's view, become only one place, among many (if they had to be retained), where people could learn about, and grow into, the world. Goodman has proposed allowing them, along with other educational resources, to provide opportunities for the time, interest, and attention of children.[62] On the other hand, Goodman is sufficiently cognizant of the structure of present society to be aware that his incidental style of education can only develop when learning activities are released from the monopolistic control of schools and placed within the community where he has suggested they historically belong and traditionally have meaning.

Released from the obligation of being required to attend formal schools, individuals engaged in learning activities would be free of external controls, bureaucratic machinery and requirements, and other "excrescences."[63] Any "control" or "motivation" that would ensue could arise as a result of the individual's merely absorbing the ongoing affairs of society. If such an incidental education is achieved, or reinstated, as a viable form of educating, Goodman has faith that a new belief in education will emerge, purging and reforming the former beliefs and mythologies associated with formal schooling.[64] It is only then that his appeal, geared towards producing a new man, encompassed by a new order, has (in his eyes) a chance of achieving realization.

Implications and Consequences of Goodman's Critique of Schooling: Man and Schools as they Are

Goodman's insights into the development of man as he is now is closely tied to his analysis of man's condition as it has arisen as a result of the formal processes of schooling through which a majority of a society's or culture's citizenry must pass. An important implication of these insights and this analysis of Goodman's is that what man's nature is and is likely to be will not change unless man himself can change, perhaps with the aid of a new style of educational process offering opportunities for continued growth and development. The sheer enormity of such a task as envisaged by Goodman will enable many of us to catch a glimpse of some of the agony and anxiety of the eternal myth: that of Sisyphus, the man condemned to roll a rock up a mountain only to see it fall back to the bottom, to return to the bottom himself to take up his unending task. In this respect Sisyphus represents the existing condition of man, and the rock, the new order which is yet to be created.

Fortunately though, at least in the view of many of Goodman's followers, there is enough of the optimist in his makeup to lead him to the conclusion that most of an individual's unused powers (e.g., spontaneity, initiative, etc.) will assert themselves in society, the culture, and the schools anyway, and make trouble, and that cramped and repressed powers (a product of the present social order) will produce distorted or labile effects attempting to subvert the normal functioning of societal or cultural institutions and agencies (such as the schools):

> A society cannot have decided all the possibilities beforehand and have structured them. If society becomes too tightly integrated and pre-empts all the available space,

> materials, and methods, then it is failing to provide for just the margin of formlessness, real risk, novelty, spontaneity, that makes growth possible . . . . When . . . goals become so regulated that people feel they cannot be "themselves" . . . they bolt and look for fringes, and margins, loopholes, holes in the wall, or they just run. Society pre-empts space, property, actions.[65]

As evidenced in this and other statements by Goodman, it is the so-called "anti-social" or "bad" effects of the present social system and the wider culture upon which Goodman pins some of his hopes for a new man and a new order (e.g., delinquency is therefore often conceived by him as growth or development that is blocked; "anti-social" behavior is the individual regulating his own progress through society and refusing to adjust to cultural norms).[66] If the individual reacts to present society and its agencies in this way Goodman is confident activities society deems as "bad" (e.g., "free" roaming, "open" sexuality, and aggressive conduct) will turn out to be "good," especially with respect to man's future growth and development within a new kind of order.

Overall Implication from the Three Perspectives

Perhaps the most pertinent pedagogical and social-psychological questions Goodman is directing to other educators in his critique of formal schooling are these: Is it really necessary for the human animal to lose in spontaneity and imagination as it gains in knowledge and technique? Must we shed the brightness of childhood as we put on the armour plating of age and maturity?

Goodman's answer to both questions is a definitive "No!". In fact, he would go as far as to say that if stultification, standardization, and intervention are erased from most aspects of a child's natural development (including learning), his adolescent and adult life will obviously stand a good chance for educational adventure, discovery, and recurring growth and development. Moreover, if such powers as spontaneity, imagination and awareness have been lost in childhood, as Goodman supposes they most likely have been in the present society, they will be recovered in adult life, if the individual takes part in incidental inquiry. In such situations the individual will learn and develop unimpeded as he perfects his potential human nature. Apparently, a true education, like human nature which aids its growth, cannot, at least in Goodman's assessment, be totally or perhaps even partially described in advance. It is the freedom to establish one's own directions. Learning incidentally according to one's own internal messages or cues is one path. The seeking of viable alternatives tailored to, or garnered from, the particular preferences of individuals, is a step towards another.

Footnotes to Chapter VI

[1] This historical perspective is afforded generous airing in Goodman's article "The Present Moment in Education," *Notre Dame Journal of Education*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 1970, pp. 17-32 (see Appendix II).

[2] Goodman's position *vis-à-vis* progressive education was outlined in Chapter V. For Goodman's critique of formal schooling from the pedagogical perspective see his *New Reformation: Notes of a Neolithic Conservative*, New York: Random House, 1970, Chapter 3 (see Appendix I, item 33). Here, and in a later section of this chapter, the incidental education process is described.

[3] See, e.g., Goodman's *Compulsory Mis-Education*, New York: Horizon Press, 1964 (see Appendix I, item 22).

[4] Goodman develops this theme in *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, and *The Community of Scholars*, New York: Random House, 1962 (see Appendix I, item 17).

[5] Goodman stresses this point in *Compulsory Mis-Education*, *op. cit.*, and "The Universal Trap," Daniel Schreiber (ed) *Profile of the School Dropout*, New York: Vintage Books, 1968, pp. 372-382. This notion of Goodman's was pursued in Chapter II, with respect to the much broader framework of present society in which schools were cited alongside other intervening "objects" in the environment (such as organized bureaucracies) as posing threats to the development of man's basic nature (see Appendix II).

[6] In this respect, the incidental education process appears nothing more than providing an optimum environment (iterated in Chapter II) which is invigorating and "friendly" enough to energize the individual into drawing out his basic nature.

[7] See, e.g., Goodman's *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, and the final chapter "Crisis and New Spirit" in his *Utopian Essays and Practical Proposals*, New York: Random House, 1962, pp. 274-289 (see Appendix I, item 16).

[8] P. Goodman, "No Processing Whatsoever," in B. and R. Gross (eds) *Radical School Reform*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969, pp. 98-105 (see Appendix II).

[9] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

[10] Goodman, *The Community of Scholars*, *op. cit.*, p. 212. The idea of intrinsic motivation reiterated in the following section (i.e., the pedagogical perspective) of this chapter appears to stem from the writer's statement in Chapter II that the individual (in Goodman's view) regulates his own progress within the environment by responding to his own impulses, urges, or needs, etc.

[11] P. Goodman, "Freedom and Learning," in S. Gorowitz (ed) *Freedom and Order in the University*, New York: Random House, 196[illegible], pp. 31-41 (see Appendix I, item 442).

[12] It is interesting to perhaps compare the similarity of the writer's conception of Goodman's view of man as he once was, as evidenced here, with that provided in Chapter II.

[13] Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-Education*, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

[14] P. Goodman, *Growing Up Absurd*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960 (see Appendix I, item 14).

[15] P. Goodman, "High School is Too Much," *Psychology Today*, Vol. 4, No. 5, October 1970, pp. 25-26 (see Appendix II).

[16] Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-Education*, *op. cit.*, pp. 15-16.

[17] Goodman, *The Community of Scholars*, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

[18] This connection or relationship between human nature and the rise of a new social order is treated in Chapter II.

[19] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-72.

[20] P. Goodman, "How the School Establishment Hoaxes the Public," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 50, No. 1, September 1968, pp. 18-19 (see Appendix II).

[21] The startling similarity between Goodman's version of past learners (as evidenced in the historical perspective) and the kind mentioned here cannot be overestimated.

[22] P. Goodman, "Deschooling Society: Pitiful Waste of Youthful Years," *Urban Review*, Vol. 52, No. 252, November 1971, pp. 22-23 (see Appendix II).

[23] P. Goodman, "Are the Schools That Necessary?" *National Catholic Reporter*, Vol. 4, No. 30, May 22, 1968, p. 8 (see Appendix I, item 247).

[24] Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-Education*, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-17.

[25] Goodman, "The Present Moment in Education," *op. cit.*, p. 22. Such tactics are described in the following sections of this chapter.

[26] F. Perls, R. Hefferline, and P. Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, New York: Julian Press, 1951, p. 316 (see Appendix I, item 10).

[27] Goodman, "The Present Moment in Education," *op. cit.*, p. 21.

[28] Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-Education*, *op. cit.*, p. 259.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 89.

[30] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

[31] *Ibid.*, pp. 70-71.

[32] Goodman, *The Community of Scholars*, *op. cit.*, p. 380.

[33] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

[34] Goodman, "The Present Moment in Education," *op. cit.*, p. 19.

[35] Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-Education*, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

[36] P. Goodman, "Mini-Schools: A Prescription for the Reading Problem," in K. Ryan and J. Cooper (eds) *Kaleidoscope: Readings in Education*, New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1972, pp. 252-258 (see Appendix II).

[37] P. Goodman, "The Community of Scholars, 1962," *Commentary*, Vol. 33, No. 3, March 1962, pp. 205-207 (see Appendix I, item 169).

[38] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 338.

[39] Goodman, "The Universal Trap," *op. cit.*, p. 374.

[40] Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-Education*, *op. cit.*, pp. 15-16.

[41] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*; p. 76.

[42] Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-Education*, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

[43] This theme of Goodman's (i.e., present society's de-emphasis of certain basic characteristics within man's nature) and that cited previously, concerning the "fitting" of individuals to the existing order, are twin aspects of the writer's treatment of Goodman's version of man as he is now (incorporated within Chapter II).

[44] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 343.

[45] Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-Education*, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 89.

[47] Goodman, *Growing Up Absurd*, *op. cit.*, p. 224.

[48] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

[49] Goodman, *The Community of Scholars*, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 214 (see Chapter VIII).

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 206.

[52] P. Goodman, *Like a Conquered Province—The Moral Ambiguity of America*, New York: Random House, 1967, p. 9 (see Appendix I, item 27).

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

[54] Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-Education*, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

[55] Goodman, *The Community of Scholars*, *op. cit.*, p. 210.

[56] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 439.

[57] P. Goodman, *Five Years: Thoughts During a Useless Time*, New York: Brussell and Brussell, 1966, p. 73 (see Appendix I, item 26).

[58] These learning arrangements are discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.

[59] The writer has afforded this policy generous treatment in preceding chapters of this thesis (see especially Chapters II, III and IV).

[60] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 297.

[61] P. Goodman, "Why Are There No Alternatives?", *Evergreen Review*, Vol. 4, No. 16, January - February 1961, p. 2 (see Appendix I, item 158).

[62] Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-Education*, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

[63] W.K. Selden, "Review of *The Community of Scholars*," *Saturday Review*, Vol. 45, December 15, 1962, p. 61 (see Appendix I, item 580).

[64] Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-Education*, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-17.

[65] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

[66] This is a theme of Goodman's chapter on delinquency in *Growing Up Absurd*.

Chapter VII

GOODMAN'S QUEST FOR VIABLE ALTERNATIVES IN EDUCATION

> Every man shall count for one, said Bentham, and not more than one: that is the maxim of democracy. Every man shall count for one—and not less than one—that is the maxim of education. The whole issue of the development of true human personality lies in that slight change of phrase.
>
> Cyril Norwood, *The English Tradition of Education*

It is perhaps only fitting that after we have been provided, as in the previous discussion, with Goodman's awareness and criticism of the compulsory and bureaucratic nature of present school organizations (which he rejects by the force and thrust of his negative critique and powerful arguments), that we should be confronted in a further instance with Goodman's speculations about changing this situation by the implementation of a number of educational alternatives; and, through his construction in detail and evangelical popularization[1] of a possible programme (stressing the liberation of learners from situations of oppression) as a basis for common agreement about the new educational order which is yet to be created or merely rediscovered.[2] In the light of this discovery, we should then see Goodman's alternative educational arrangements and ideas as the second, and perhaps final, link between his educational writings and what the writer conceives to be Goodman's views concerning human nature (particularly those aspects related to man as he once was and could become). These alternatives are a major aspect of Goodman's unique contribution to educational reform, and are a complementary component to his critique of formal schooling. Much of the following discussion is related to this concern with educational alternatives, and the expressed nature and content of their link to what has been proposed as Goodman's views on human nature.

The Nature of Goodman's Alternatives in Education: Images of What Man Was and Could Become

> Growth is something that the organism itself does. No one can grow for another, nor learn for another.
>
> M. V. C. Jeffreys, *Glaucon*

The basis for Goodman's positive posing of alternatives in education (and, for that matter, his negative critique of schooling) rests heavily on the assumption that no single institution or process[3] can prepare everybody for their choice of destinies in the kind of open social order Goodman proposes.[4] On the other hand, Goodman's alternative learning proposals and arrangements offer many and various means or instruments (both general and specific) for educating and paths for growing up, including different kinds of semi-formal and informal schools, no schools at all, community services, the city, the home, the street, meaningful work activities, play, taking part in the affairs of society or the culture, revised functions for learners and teachers, the use of human and material resources, and a "curriculum" of experience.[5]

In proposing such alternatives, Goodman not only illustrates his distrust of what formal schools have become, but also holds to models of institutions which he believes successfully functioned in the past (e.g., the community of scholars resembles the medieval university; mini-schools are like the one-room schoolhouse), and to which with some updating to be sure, and experimentation with new forms, the community would want to return.[6] Therefore, Goodman would retain much of the current structure of the elementary and university levels of schooling (especially their basic form and learning functions as opposed to their bureaucratic operations), although concentrating on the development of new experimental forms (e.g., subsidized community services) outside of these traditional structures. Regrouping learning interests along natural and self-motivated lines, he would also discard the secondary school completely, in favour of community activities and a few para-university academic institutions. Thus, on the one hand, while referring to these revitalized and new learning forms, Goodman expresses the sentiment that the process of merely imbibing in the on-going affairs of society should once again be the chief means of living and learning. Alternately, he advocates the view that schools should only be one place, among many, where people can learn about and grow into the world.

According to the position Goodman has adopted,

> . . . a much more reasonable over-all pattern (of educating) is to structure all of society and the whole environment as educative, with the schools playing the much more particular and traditional role of giving intensive training when it is needed or sought, or of being havens for those scholarly by disposition.[7]

In this way Goodman intended to keep the institutional learning forms as simple or pure and as minimal as possible, with a wide variety of small educational units (as decentralized alternatives) in which learners could work on their own initiative.[8] Further, by keeping the fit between the individual's interaction with his environment as close as possible,[9] Goodman was optimistic that participants in educational activities would experiment widely and freely with new procedures involving interpersonal relationships and personal contacts.

Characteristics of Goodman's Alternatives in Education: General Educational Proposals and Specific Learning Arrangements

Goodman's educational schemas, drawn directly from his ideas on incidental education and human nature, and featuring a wide range of alternative educational proposals and learning arrangements (i.e., alternatives to the process of formal schooling)—both general and specific—would anticipate a humanitarian, populist, and libertarian-style revolution in education accompanying or resulting from the exchange in power from the school bureaucracies and organizations to the people directly concerned in educational endeavours. More specifically, Goodman's educational alternatives, which can be directly linked to the writer's conception of Goodman's views regarding human nature, involve an implementation of the following:

(A) *General Educational Proposals*

(i) A series of reference services for learners and teachers. These services would include free access by the learner to educational tools and resources: *(a)* human resources, and *(b)* material resources;

(ii) a redefinition of the function of the learner in society;

(iii) a redefinition of the function of the teacher in society;

(iv) a "curriculum" of experience.

(B) *Specific Learning Arrangements*

(i) New patterns of education (roughly) at the formative level;

(ii) new patterns of education (roughly) at the adolescent level;

(iii) new patterns of education (roughly) at the post-adolescent or adult level.

Before attempting to set out each of Goodman's educational alternatives more fully, it should be emphasized that the main danger which Goodman foresees if any one of his alternatives was chosen or proved acceptable to the present school system would be the emergence or creation of another monopolizing system (employing or including new structures and new rigidities) in place of the previous one. This possibility Goodman wants to stringently avoid at all costs, otherwise the search for alternatives in education would fail as he believed other humanitarian, populist, or libertarian educational schemes did (e.g., the practical application of progressive education). As Goodman mentioned in an interview in *Saturday Review*: "[You] wipe out the system, you get another system. The important thing is to loosen the system. And you loosen it by 2 per cent of this, 3 per cent of that . . . ."[10] Therefore, in Goodman's schema, any new organization or structure resulting from the implementation of one or a number of his alternatives should come about naturally because it functioned effectively for the benefit of its adherents, not because of the pressure of external restraints.[11]

(A) *General Educational Proposals*

(i) *A Series of Reference Services*

(a) The use of human resources.

> Education is like the art of the gardener under whose care a thousand trees blossom and grow. He contributes nothing to their actual growth; the principles of growth lie in the trees themselves. He plants and waters, but God gives the increase. . . . So with the educator: he imparts no single power to men. He only watches lest any external force should injure or disturb. He takes care that development runs its course in accordance with its own laws.
>
> Pestalozzi

One way Goodman perceived of mending the rift that had occurred between personal and social aspects of an individual's growth and development in the present social order (i.e., pertaining to man as he is in present society) was the offering of adequate "real" human "objects" in the person's environment to ensure the continuity of past traditions, and at the same time provide adequate models or examples for emulation, imitation or adaptation. As Goodman was often prone to argue, the process of growth and development requires a goal. Children must be directed towards something worthwhile in personal and social relations. They must also grow up to be something admirable by constantly having admirable models, patterns, and associations. Thus, growth must be towards an ideal of human character. With respect to this process of modelling and imitation, the activities of growing up and the provision of ways of becoming educated are depicted as synonymous:

> Education is a natural community function and occurs inevitably, since the young grow up on the old, towards their activities, and into (or against) their institutions; and the old foster, teach, train, exploit, and abuse the young.[12]

The models Goodman wishes to take from the adult culture as worthy for adulation by youth are particularly those "great men" who might give youth some idea of a "complete" and finished individual, i.e., a whole person. Such contact, whether incidentally or intentionally followed, would bring some meaning and notion of totality to the individual's educational experiences and personal growth.[13] In its more intentional aspects personal contact also possesses a sound pedagogical base; in fact, one that has firm foundations in the 11th or 12th century:

> Either a youth says show me How, and finds a teacher who will show him . . . or a thinker professes a truth he knows and a fascinated youth latches on to him and asks What and Why.[14]

When reviewing these human resources with regard to their practical application within society, Goodman has acknowledged that such important resources for educational purposes are frequently overlooked by educators in plotting alternative future paths in education. Therefore, a major advantage to be gained by using a variety of such resources is that they are already existent in society (and therefore freely available), and as such do not have to be created. According to Goodman, we should put to use the unlicensed adults in our communities—e.g., the chemist, the storekeeper, the mechanic—to enrich the educational experiences of young people, and initiate them through proper educators into the grown-up world.[15] In addition, Goodman would also import outside professionals, artists in residence, gurus, mothers, and dropouts to serve as aides to learners in societal situations.[16] This general alternative would seek to fulfill a two-fold purpose: it would enable learners to find out what people in the "real" world do (i.e., provide fascinating and broadening learning experiences); and concomitantly, would widen the circle of adult relationships and interpersonal concerns these youngsters can relate to (i.e., provide opportunities for free socialization).

(b) The use of material resources.

> For almost every item that men have invented there are alternative choices.
>
> Paul and Percival Goodman, *Communitas*

Besides placing an emphasis on the importance of exposing youngsters to adequate adult models in their environments, especially with respect to showing them opportunities for free adaptation to these educational "objects," Goodman additionally stresses the importance of "real" material resources in the environment in providing individuals with opportunities for reflection and experiment.[17]

One alternative in education of a general nature Goodman felt was urgently and particularly required was the decentralization of educational resources in centres apart or away from the formal schools. It should be understood that these units are perceived as voluntary[18] centres wherein the "teacher"[19] teaches and the learner learns insofar as the learner authorizes. Any learning experiences involved would be free of time and space limitations, and organized so that the learner may acquire new skills or attainments extending his personal, intellectual or social development. Thus, there would be little necessity for abstract grades or categories to measure a person's progress because learning would be geared towards enhancing interpersonal relationships, the release of individuality, and opportunities for meaningful growth and development through closer and wider human contacts.

Goodman's proposal to harness material resources (incorporating human ones) would envisage, in its practical ramifications, the use of small units (schools could "fall apart" into units of perhaps 100 people) in available buildings in cities and rural areas, clubhouses, libraries, etc., as centres for voluntary socialization, combined play activities, discussion, informal instruction and advice, incidental learning activities, and refuge.[20] These units or learning centres could possibly consist of communities of teachers and learners who wanted to learn or "teach" knowledge or skills, or merely find things out. For the running of special events these units or centres could be brought together into a common auditorium or gymnasium to give its participants a greater sense of community and opportunities for developing wider personal contacts.[21]

As one instance of the use to which community resources could be put, Goodman proposed that the Parkway Project in Philadelphia was, even though still in its formative stages, the beginning of a laudable effort. It enabled students and teachers in Philadelphia to use community settings, such as business, factories, and government offices for learning activities and never have to occupy a school building. Despite the "strengths" of the new programme, Goodman, after a (1970) visit to Philadelphia foresaw that "the only way for the Parkway Programme to work properly is to divorce itself from the confining shackles of the school board and branch out on its own as an independent entity."[22] If it failed to do this, Goodman surmised that it would remain a living example of a viable educational alternative—but within the present school structure.

(ii) *A Redefinition of the Role of the Learner in Society*

> No one can acquire for another—not one,
> No one can grow for another—not one.

> The song is to the singer, and comes back most to him,
> The teaching is to the teacher, and comes back most to
> him.
>
> Walt Whitman, *The Song of the Rolling Earth*

> They know enough who know how to learn.
>
> Henry Adams

For his plan involving the use of alternatives in education to function effectively, Goodman suggests as a general, yet preliminary or prior step, a redefinition of the function of the learner in our societies. He assumes all young people want to learn and if left to their own devices they will seek out sources of knowledge. When learning (and "teaching") is consonant with the learner's state of intrinsic interests, there is no problem of motivation to learn because the individual has motivation already.[23] Given his new function, the educated man would be one who has simply acquired the skills of learning, and the aim of all learning activities is to provide the learner with opportunities to engage in experiences to promote his continuing growth and development as he makes his way in society. Any learning which takes place would occur as a result of personal activity, not (as formerly) because of professional ministrations. In their uninhibited settings, learners would be self-starting, self-initiating people who could capably develop or adequately cope with new skills, attitudes, or knowledge as they confronted them in their changing environments.[24] Therefore, the important things for learners to acquire are the skills of learning, the predisposition for, and habit of, continuous learning, and particularly the ability to adapt to and create change.

According to what Goodman has termed this "tailor-made" approach to educational enquiry, learners would shop around to discover their individual interests, wants, or needs without penalty.[25] In line with Goodman's educational proclamations, societal knowledge or skills worth the most at a particular point in time to the learner would subsequently gain precedence over knowledge of most worth to society transmitted by teachers (as was previously the practice) to their docile recipients in schools. The learner has more say in what is learned, and when, and how. What is learned, in Goodman's opinion, is that which the learner now knows he needs, not what he has been told he needs to know, or what has been served up to him on a platter. Undoubtedly, Goodman believes the things people need to know are the things they most need to know for personal reasons. Goodman's advice to students *à propos* of this context is that given by Prince Kropotkin in *A Letter to the Young*:

> Ask what world do you want to live in? What are you good at and want to work at to build that world? What do you need to know? Demand that your teachers teach you that.[26]

Confronted with what could be described as a reversal of the traditional function of the teacher and learner with respect to how learning should take place, we should be remiss not to underscore Goodman's assumption that this special kind of learner would thrive in growth-promoting, facilitative relationships with other people (e.g., peers, adults, "teachers," etc.). Moreover, the development of interpersonal relationships ("erotic attachments") between facilitators of learning, on the one hand, and the learners themselves, based on mutual trust and an acknowledgement of an individual's real worth, is Goodman's ultimate ideal.[27]

(iii) *A Redefinition of the Role of the Teacher in Society*

> Dictators ride to and fro upon tigers which they dare not dismount. And the tigers are getting hungry.
>
> Sir Winston Churchill, *While England Slept*

> The very first casualty in the present-day school system may well be the whole business of teacher-led instruction as we now know it.
>
> Marshall McLuhan and George B. Leonard

Primarily because he is so committed to his views about the way people function in their "natural" environments, Goodman is opposed to "teaching" children unless they reach out and ask. In this respect Goodman proposes that there cannot be teaching at all, since learning must start from the learner's intrinsic interests and needs, which provide a basis for what he learns and assimilates as "second nature." Moreover, Goodman, as Carl Rogers has done, denies that there can be "teachers" at all ("teaching" is largely a delusion), although people do learn. The child, for example, learns by exploring, questions, aping, taking part, coping, and by sociability.[28] Although Goodman would not scrap the role of the teacher completely (e.g., when a child wants to find something out), he suggests that the right care of children proceeds in a Rousseau-Emile style of relationship. Adopting the position taken by Sylvia Ashton-Warner of late,[29] Goodman allows that "teachers" be "real" objects in the child's environment who provide good models, make the environment safe, and are sociable:

> Let (the children) alone and be around; where "be around" means . . . to provide safety, audience for the exploit, consolation for the hurt, suggestion and material equipment for the next step, and answers when asked.[30]

As Goodman was quite aware, however, his alternatives proposing a redefinition of the function of the teacher must focus on the need to divert present teachers from their positions of authority as customary deliverers, and concomitantly, learners, in their role as customary receivers of packaged goods, into the function of mutual probers and discoverers in the environment. What appears to concern Goodman most, of course, is that the only environment in which the child presently is allowed to grow is that of the school. Therefore, he calls for the abolition of teacher-led instruction in the formal sense of the word, as it is presently perceived in schools.

Freed from their bureaucratic accountability to, or representation of, an institution such as the formal school, Goodman acknowledges that teachers, and more especially learners, would embark as huntsmen on an educational voyage of discovery and adventure in a multitude of learning environments favouring elective activities. Like doctors with their patients, teachers would have the professional and personal freedom to work with learners as they saw best. The teacher's rightful authority to administer to the children's needs and wants would be the authority of knowledge, experience, and techniques, rather than the authority of bureaucratic status or power. This stance of Goodman's prompts him to suggest that society needs to employ more model teachers who are respected because they know something or have some other personal value, and who play an exemplary role in the world in which youth can learn to share and grow.[31]

In Goodman's schema, the task of educators is simply a matter of putting information and relevant equipment at the disposal of the learner, if and when he desired them, and participate if invited or merely loiter in the background to see what happened and give advice. Further, along with other interest groups in society, educators would draw up the rules of licensing and hiring of individuals.[32] When the learner felt he was ready to be examined for a skill required by an employer, he would then catch hold of a pedagogue and ask him for a test on it.[33] Thus, from Goodman's vantage point, a learner's performance on standardized tests is expected to be the chief criterion for any form of evaluation. Credit could also be arranged for travel, work, subsidized reading, etc.

(iv) *A "Curriculum" of Experience*

> We are now at the point where we must educate people in what nobody knew yesterday and prepare for what no one knows yet, but what some people must know tomorrow.
>
> Margaret Mead

> Education is the acquisition of the art of the utilization of knowledge.
>
> A. N. Whitehead, *The Aims of Education*

According to Goodman, there is only one "curriculum": that which "is basic and universal in human experience and practice."[34] A proper "curriculum" grows out of what children need and want to function successfully in society, and what adults and the community have to give. This "curriculum" of experience is forever responsive to community needs and the needs of children. In fact, the body of knowledge and know-how (techniques and skills) from which the "curriculum" emanates grows with the community as it itself grows, and while preserving the best values of the past, has as a dominant characteristic a carefully considered flexibility and openness to change. While uncovering this revelation, Goodman suggests that individuals should learn what is important to the historical development and traditions of the culture (i.e., intellectual knowledge), besides skills or knowledge which may help them survive or simply get by (i.e., instrumental knowledge). This is not to say that one kind of knowledge supplants the other in importance in Goodman's schema, or that one has less purpose than another.

With respect to intellectual knowledge or endeavours, Goodman prized human understanding and cultural curiosity over planned or packaged knowledge for a social purpose (i.e., knowledge designed to fit individuals into a complex technology). Knowledge about a person's culture, Goodman believed, would complete the "wholeness," the unfinished makeup of the individual. As he reveals in chapters of *Growing Up Absurd*, the result of such enlightenment would be recognizable in the pride an individual took in his culture and traditions (patriotism), in his cognizance of, and alertness to, his responsibilities as a member of society (citizenship), and in how his existence was imbued with a sense of purpose (faith). In this case, it is easy to label Goodman old-fashioned and conservative, but unlike many reformers who advocated educational reforms, he saw the immense contribution and worth of, for example, Euclid's geometry, Kepler's physics, and Einstein's mathematics, with regard to a person's attainment of a world or "whole" view concerning the universe which could be adventurously acted upon.

By advocating an instrumental kind of knowledge in addition to his intellectual knowledge, Goodman was eager to tie knowledge (thinking), action (response), and even feeling (being) together within the individual's normal functioning.[35] Because he viewed man as an active agent and his responses to his environment as functional,[36] Goodman contended that the study of inert knowledge (i.e., knowledge unrelated to what was truly needed for a person's growing up) was a waste of time. Rather, an individual must learn what is necessary for him to grow and develop, i.e., in his environment the kinds of things he has to know are what he needs to know for a reason when he wants to know them.[37] In making a case for such learning, Goodman supplies us with the example of a child who may not be able to count but can make change for a $1 bill. As Goodman preceptively explains this instance: "To those brought up on them, new times are not new, they are just the times."[38] This point of view also underscores the fact that an individual cannot be active in an area of exploration without being actively engaged in the subject matter, whether it be "real" objects or "real" people.[39]

To overcome this difficulty, Goodman proposed that individuals should pragmatically work out truths (of their own or accepted from the culture) to see if these propositions which they formulated or believed to be true worked out in the practicality of everyday experience. Therefore, he never loses sight of the fact that all knowledge must have specific ends in view (whether intellectual or instrumental), should discover a purpose in enterprise, or develop a method and procedure, enabling the person to finish or complete his association with his environment. In advocating this doctrine, Goodman recognized the debt he owed to the pragmatists.

(B) *Specific Learning Arrangements*

(i) *New Patterns of Education (roughly) at the Formative Level*

Up to age 12, Goodman suggests that the chief purpose of formative education would be directed towards delaying, rather than hastening the process of socialization for children, to enable them to grow and develop unimpeded by authoritarian controls and cultural conventions, unless, of course, they desired them. The important task is not to motivate the child, but to avoid discouraging his intrinsic motivations. Then he is able to release his individuality free of external infringements.[40] Like Dewey and A.S. Neill before him, Goodman proposes various protective and life-nourishing environments be provided for the young during this early period, including many paths of growing up and many ways of learning, so that the small child, left to his own resources, can "poke interestedly into whatever goes on and is able, by observations, questions, and practical imitation, to get something out of it on his own terms."[41] By this means the child's wildness and basic nature[42] has a chance to express itself, and such an environment protects him against being fitted to a fixed culture prematurely, if at all.[43] Undoubtedly, it makes no difference to Goodman what the child learns (up to age 12) about the on-going affairs of society, so long as he goes on wanting to learn more, and grows without restraints.

At particular times in his writings Goodman has stressed that mini-schools, no school buildings at all, or simply the streets of the city could adequately perform this function which he indicates is vital for the normal growth and development of the young and the freeing of their basic natures.

To provide a protective and life-nourishing environment for children up to age 12, Goodman suggests that tiny mini-schools, reminiscent of Dennison's "First Street School" in New York and Neill's "Summerhill" in England, are the best models for learning.[44] These schools are no bigger than the little red schoolhouse of yore, and some sense of Goodman's wanting to return to a form of educating that was simple, yet functioned effectively in past communities, is evidenced here.[45] Mini-learning or small resource centres (more specific in format when compared to those material resources described previously), including 4 teachers and 28 children, and comprised of colonies of licensed teachers, unlicensed elders, housewives, cooks, teenagers, or college graduates, and providing no formal subjects or pre-arranged curriculum, could be established throughout the community as learning centres, particularly for those children who, for one reason or another, were sometimes compelled to leave a parent or their homes.[46] Therefore, in many cases, these mini-schools, besides offering positive returns, would merely suffice as houses of refuge for children to resort to, when necessary, to escape parental and neighbourhood tyranny or terror.

Since Goodman acknowledges children live in communities where people do not always take an interest in the welfare of their charges, and since children must often be rescued from their homes, he feels that a Summerhill-type mini-school offering therapy for the child whose development has been arrested (i.e., there are characteristics of "bad growth") or guidance for the child who willingly seeks it should be offered to most children: "Summerhill . . . (is) like a therapeutic community: the wounded child broods by himself in a secure and loving setting that imposes on him no pressure or compulsion, while nature heals."[47] In such settings, Goodman would use psychotherapy to heal old wounds, correct emotional malfunctions ("splits" and "interventions"), or release tensions pent up during a previous period.[48] This would lead to an awareness of the young child's situation, an exploration of his feelings about himself and others, and sessions of informal instruction where "teachers" or leaders and peers guide him to articulate problems and help solve them.[49] "Teachers" would have some knowledge of psychotherapy[50] and release these tensions and inhibitions in the child's present functioning by approving eurhythmics, physical therapy, and sexual expression in learning activities.[51]

Probably an even better model than the mini-school at the formative level, in Goodman's view, would be that of the "Athenian pedagogue, touring the city with his charges."[52] Anticipating the Parkway Programme in Philadelphia by several years, Goodman advises that teachers should dispense with the school building for many classe[illegible] the function of learning would replace administrative organizations. One reason he gives for advocating this proposal is his belief that classrooms cannot compete with the city's resources for many important kinds of learning experiences.[53] The ancients, Goodman attempts to remind us, knew this: the great teachers of Greece preferred to instruct and engage in idle discourse while walking the streets. Moreover, the Stoics got their name from Stoa, the protected walkways on which they liked to teach.

Particularly in *The Empire City* Goodman drew upon the ideas of the Greeks in composing his informal educational activities for the young. According to him, the sociological garden (i.e., the city, etc.) would be the best place in which to educate. Since he argues that people are learning for life (and living activities), children and teachers should try to become a little closer to it, as they are part of it. Devising an experimental approach to learning featuring a kind of community dynamics, Goodman conceives of a teacher in charge of a band of 10 youngsters (i.e., the Greek model), using the city itself as the material for the curriculum and the background for the learning—e.g., streets, cafeterias, stores, movies, museums, parks, and factories. Catering to a few hundred children (overall) for days on end, "teachers" would take their charges into a problem area, and study and work with the people or material resources involved. Given the opportunity they possess for understanding the problem from first-hand experience, learners irradiate a solution from within their number, or solutions often emerge primarily as a result of their active participation in a societal setting.

The following examples extracted from a pedagogical system Goodman favours in *The Empire City* for small groups of children (between the ages of 1 and 12) and a "teacher," provide some measure of the manner in which Goodman not only adheres or is indebted to a Greek-style of formative education he is assured functioned effectively in the past, but also adopts a pragmatic, problem-solving approach for young learners:

> 5. Time to eat. On the fifth of May let's have our soup, sandwich and tea in a clean bright restaurant. Make them

> [i.e., the children] confront the fact that some of this food comes from a dead animal, even at the risk of spoiling their appetites or getting them nauseous. (This is very important). . . . We mix our own salad, buying the ingredients beforehand in a local store. 10 spices. Mix and try—try and mix. Different kinds of greens and different formulas of the dressing. Theory of cutting the oil with lemon and vinegar. Are there contraries among the spices? Sweet salt bitter sour. . . . Now compare our dressing with a popular bottled brand, with an expensive bottled brand. Why need these be so awful? (Another day, different breads). Pause. Scatter. Meet again.
>
> 6. Walking southward toward midtown and Queensboro Bridge. Time the traffic lights. Advantages and disadvantages of progressive lights. Theory and practice of jaywalking and of preventing jaywalking. Go on to the roof of a high building for a total view of the traffic as it moves and stops: where does it come from? Where is it going? Should there be red and green lights only, or red, green and yellow? What are the reasons for the colours? Proposal to control the coloured neon lights and keep them off certain avenues: we compose a letter on this subject to the Times. Compose letters pro and con. Will such letters have any influence? In what circumstances?[54]

As Goodman conceives formative styles of educating, the most desirable society for growing children in which to learn, once they have passed the age of complete dependency on their parents, is, in the final instance, other children, both older and younger, as well as elders in the community. Unquestionably, many of his small-school models and community-group activities form part of this desirable society. Although Goodman's society is described as being "rough" when judged by many standards, it is supposedly characterized at best by real conflicts and tensions rather than by absolute authority. For Goodman, it is the most worthy and acceptable environment to bring to fruition the growing child's potential nature.[55] Adults, older children and others who are literate and well-intentioned are said to already possess all the requisite knowledge and skills necessary for the education of small children, and Goodman contends that if these individuals have to be trained at all, they should be trained in group therapy, because those skills are the only ones that are useful. Ideally,

> [teachers] for this [early] age are those who like children, pay attention to them, answer their questions, enjoy taking them around the city and helping them explore, imitate, try out, and who sing songs with them and teach them games.[56]

Confronted with innumerable opportunities related to learning within his environment, the young learner would then "grow up pretty independent, ironical without fierceness, quite amiable, for nothing threatens: a smart-aleck through and through who knows his way around."[57]

(ii) *New Patterns of Education (roughly) at the Adolescent Level*

Goodman advocates that during adolescence, every youth should be provided with an opportunity to find himself and grow further only by coping with the work, sex, and chances of the real world. As does Friedenberg, one of the reasons why Goodman wants to abolish compulsory attendance at high schools[58] is that young people who are kept in tutelage, particularly at the high and college level, although they are necessarily economically independent, cannot pursue the sexual, adventurous, and political activities congenial to them.[59] Arguing that it is useless to feed the youth curricular imitations, Goodman proposes getting them into life sooner. In this respect growing up is never far removed from learning within the environment.[60]

As Goodman often argues in *Compulsory Mis-Education* and *The Community of Scholars*, our societies are, purportedly, in the process of returning to classic Platonic and Jeffersonian concepts of education as a process carried on by the person's participation in the life of his community.[61] When societies or cultures take into account the fact that youth (many of whom are not bookish or academically inclined) learn outside of schools, he believes that the need for community services or enterprises increases.[62] Rather than the one existing narrow, regimented school path, Goodman proposes that there should be many and various communal ways of, and means for, acquiring an education during adolescence.[63] Conceivably, Goodman's multiple paths for educating adolescents within the community, whether incidentally or even intentionally followed, favour a wide and flexible policy of exits from, and entries or re-entries into, diverse educational endeavours. For example, such endeavours would follow these general guidelines: academic work, apprenticeships, technical training, community service, self-study, subsidized programmes of choice, and subsidized cultural experiences like radio stations, newspapers, little theatres, etc.[64] With a heightened emphasis on voluntary and active participation by learners, false starts, crossovers, back-tracks, moratoriums, travel, or work done by oneself should be allowed or given freely without penalty.[65] In fact, Goodman also sought to restore periods for academic withdrawal, study, reflection, browsing or brooding, and review of work, as he felt the Greeks had frequently suggested.[66]

As far as funding is concerned, Goodman wants these schemes to be publicly supported. He is adamant that money may even have to be taken from formal schools and given over for educational activities in the community that are real, intrinsically motivated, and involve the individual's elective passage from one environmental setting to another.[67] In this manner adolescent years in the United States could be devoted to public service as they are in China and Cuba.[68]

To give a more concrete instance of his subsidized educational alternatives for adolescents, Goodman maintains that the provision of community services such as aid to the elderly, the correction of urban eyesores, pollution programmes, social action groups to eliminate poverty, social work, teaching aides, and hospital assistance, could easily be incorporated into educational tasks without undue inconvenience and strain. Similarly, there is no reason why a person, according to Goodman, could not combine the ability to repair gadgets and machines, drive a vehicle, assist the elderly or the infirm, function as an architect or social worker, or present a piece of research on urban affairs. In Goodman's overall grand design for educational enterprise, the benefits which accrue to young people are much more wide-ranging than the acquisition of only these skills: adolescents functioning in the Aristotelian-style as makers and doers in productive, meaningful jobs or community activities are enabled to freely exercise their capacities, capitalize on the availability of real training, and subsequently develop their powers of initiative.[69] Moreover, Goodman assures us that young people will take pride in their products and productivity and develop a community spirit because they like to handle live materials and resources (both human and material), make things, see objects as they are, or feel them take shape and come out as desired.[70]

A further subsidized community service of a practical nature

Goodman advocates is the building of a dormitory for teenagers, beginning at age 11. Here young people are able to live in and eat breakfasts, etc. Parents are also encouraged to live in, although children are given the opportunity to go their own way, being allowed privacy, sexual exploration and adventure, advice and food. The dormitory functions or is planned according to the backgrounds and whims of its participants once they are housed in its confines.[71]

As far as academic training is concerned, Goodman advocates a preparatory academy (for the next level of educating), taking into account James Conant's figure of 15% of the school-age population who learn or are interested in academic subjects.[72] The academy, which concentrates on what former high schools taught best (i.e., academic skills and knowledge), functions with 60 students and 3 teachers.[73] The staff, mostly university graduate students who want to teach, or earn while working on a thesis, are involved, respectively, in the physical sciences, social sciences, and the humanities. Goodman proposes that the academy should be located in, and administered by, the university, because it is preparing its students for admission to Goodman's community of scholars (the highest educational level in his plan). Despite this apparent attempt at isolating the academically talented from society, the actual professions, services, industries, and sciences are the areas in which youth acquire their practical grounding in the community.

In Goodman's educational schema during adolescence, everybody is provided with an opportunity to learn something about almost anything. Quite often, this kind of technical knowledge if learned in actual practice in offices, factories, libraries, or other community institutions, can be acquired in as little time as three weeks. Moreover, utilizing a more diversified set of voluntary learning opportunities ranging from apprenticeship programmes to academic institutions, learners could spend anywhere from a week to a month or more in any worthwhile enterprise or environment without external interference, unless required. Academic training, of course, would take longer, perhaps at a later date. The flexibility of such a scheme, at least from Goodman's standpoint, has its advantages: if a youth needed to be an architect, he would go to a certain community setting for 6 months that would enable him to learn about architecture. This scheme also possesses the added benefit of enabling the young adolescent, during a period of personal and societal conflicts and tensions, to discover the real world and uncover his true nature, whatever form it should take.

(iii) *New Patterns of Educating (roughly) at the Post-Adolescent or Adult Level*

At the post-adolescent or adult level of education, Goodman proposes fusing a community of scholarship with the community for living. In this respect his "community of scholars" shows as much concern for student happiness, administrative fluency, and growing up, as for education. More particularly, the essence of the community of scholars Goodman outlines involves personal relationships between students and professors: the emphasis in any learning or exploring activities is geared toward human interaction and intercommunication between those participating (i.e., expanding "real" contacts), and heightening the individual's awareness of reality.[74]

One reason for Goodman's proposal was his analysis that the universities and schools were drifting towards the avoidance of human contact, especially through devices administrators and professors employed for communication, teaching, and in technology.[75] To overcome the problem of anomie, Goodman chose not a Utopian model of personal relationships, but one rooted in history, especially the medieval era of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.[76] His ideal is the medieval *studium generale* which

> is anarchically self-regulating or at least self-governed; animally and civilly unrestrained; yet itself an intramural city with a universal culture; walled from the world; yet active in the world; living in a characteristically planned neighbourhood according to the principles of mutual aid; and with its members in oath-bound fealty to one another as teachers and students.[77]

Although these medieval universities as glowingly described here would appear anarchistic to modern man because they seem heavily weighted in favour of personal as opposed to academic relationships between individuals, they were, in Goodman's estimation, as much colleges for learning as experiments in living. During the medieval era, Goodman recounts, the university was a place of discussion, used primarily as a base for the airing of ideological differences, and for an exploration of extreme styles of living. Scholars and their charges, as Goodman would have it, sought to preserve the integrity of real situations by establishing an intrinsic relationship between socio-cultural and physical factors evident in the individual's makeup. Perhaps Goodman had such individuals in mind as, e.g., Abelard, Aquinas, Marsighlio of Padua, William of Occam, and Dante Alighieri when he proposed that the visions of thinkers often override the administrative hierarchy of the church, and even that of the medieval university itself.[78]

Goodman's modern answer to the medieval university was to propose that the present university structure simply "fall apart" into institutions (viz., anarchistic communities) comprising 10 teachers and from 120 to 150 students.[79] Alternatively, Goodman suggests, as Veblen and rebels of the Middle Ages had already done, ridding the present universities of their administrative functions, and, if necessary, taking the anarchist option of seceding from the Establishment or the dominant system. With reference in part to both of these options, Goodman recommends:

> This spontaneous quest by the anarchic early community of scholars to understand their culture and take responsibility for changing it should be ours as well. Our children not only grow up in a civilization immeasurably more confused and various than any before, but they are now prevented from undertaking the quest itself by foolish rules, meaningless tasks, and an absence of responsible veterans to guide them. We must restore to them the chance to discover their culture and make it their own. And if we cannot do this within the universities, it would be good for the universities themselves if we tried to do it from without.[80]

Apparently, the freedom and meaning of Berkeley in the 60's was Goodman's modern parallel of the type of experimental living and learning he assumed once took place especially in medieval times and could exist again.[81] During this decade, Goodman suggested Berkeley students formed university-centred, politically-active communities, "withdrawing" from an absurd, overorganized social system and its problems, and returning to "more authentic premises."[82] In his view, one perhaps obvious and desirable outcome of these functioning communities was the fostering of a free university atmosphere, incorporating a fringe community of the youth, and student-professor relationships wherein students had a definitive say in administrative doings and curricular offerings.

If reincarnated or revitalized within the present society, Goodman is assured that independent institutions resembling past forms of educating as well as modern forms (including Berkeley-style, "free" universities) would soon breathe a sense of solidarity into their communities through the thrust of the moral struggles (involving habits of good faith and commitment) generated among individuals, once early internal conflicts and tensions had been overcome. Such struggles are perhaps more specifically pinpointed and identified by Paul and Percival Goodman in *Communitas*:

> In the educational community, the mores are in principle permissive and experimental, and the persons form, almost invariably, a spectrum of radical thought and life, from highly moralistic religious-pacifists, through socialists . . . to free-thinking anarchists. The close contact of such persons, the democratic and convivial intermingling of faculty and students, leads inevitably to violent dissensions, sexual rivalries, threatened families. It is at this point . . . that the community could become a psychotherapeutic group and try by its travails to hammer out a new ideal for us all in these difficult areas where obviously our modern society is in transition.[83]

If any requirements for entry into the community of scholars were to be stipulated, Goodman thought 2 years spent in a maturing activity (e.g., adolescent community service) should be deemed sufficient. Opportunities for entry into the community would be available for individuals who were already involved in the sciences, the liberal arts, or principles of a profession, for those who had previously worked closely with industries in society, for those who required academic credit along the way, and for adults who already knew something. Although this policy would leave few excluded, Goodman was in sympathy with the Athenians whom he supposes to have regarded most of our present college or university curriculum as appropriate for those over the age of 30 or 35. These older individuals re-enter higher learning when they possess a strong motive for doing so. This guards against administering education in what Goodman foresees as "one fatal overdose."

Because individuals would already be engaged in the on-going affairs of society, Goodman predicts that his community of scholars would avoid the present "absurdity" of teaching a curriculum abstracted from work in the field (e.g., mechanical engineering, agriculture), and then licensing graduates to return to the field and relearn everything in terms of actual work or unlearn what they had been taught. Therefore, any academic learning within the community of scholars would generally follow, rather than precede, entry into the professions or the world of industry. The teacher or professor would make a special effort to help his young apprentice, because the subject matter would often be too complicated to simply be picked up incidentally in the course of his involvement in the on-going activities of society. Moreover, the community of scholars, including its independent guilds of scholars and students, would not be geared to the indiscriminate demands of society. In fact, testing would take place for pedagogical purposes only (i.e., either to enable the student to gauge his own progress,[84] or to test applicants according to the specific demands of the inducting institutions):[85]

> [Testing] . . . is a good method of teaching if one corrects the test but does not grade it. Students like to be tested,

> to give structure to their studying and to know where they are; if tested but not graded, they are eager to learn the right answers and they ask how to solve the problem. . . . The teacher uses tests as a diagnostic, both of what is blank to the student and of what he himself is failing to get across.[86]

Under such circumstances as Goodman envisages, when an individual continually measures his own progress in relation to the goals of the entire enterprise of which he and others are a part, he can apply for a test on the masterpiece he has created or on the knowledge he has acquired, so that his functional peers can ascertain his readiness for licensing or induction for membership into a communal guild or community of scholarship.[87]

In summary, Goodman's community of scholars is a small, self-governing collectivity of free "human spirits," which, left to its own devices, will supposedly work out styles of behaviour that will enhance the value of the lives and learning of the community. Operating under the assumption that an interpersonal, functioning pattern of learning is better than any imposed or impersonal pattern, Goodman's community of scholars ideally strives (and this example may again provide us with yet another indication of Goodman's conservatism) to recover a respect for the intrinsic worth of knowledge and cloistered learning that has, sadly, in Goodman's assessment, all but disappeared or been almost something to be deprecated within the existing social order. The university, Goodman wishes to remind us,

> is the bearer of our ancient culture, of pure science, of the universal community of mankind; of the disputation of the Middle Ages, the Scholarship of the Renaissance, and the critical spirit of the Enlightenment.[88]

If this love of learning (as well as living) was to be revived, Goodman is optimistic that his community of scholars may evidence as a result of its functioning in the existing order, a return of professional intellectuals to society, and their involvement in the pressing issues of the present age.[89]

Overall Implications of Goodman's Educational Proposals and Learning Arrangements: Visions of Man as he Once Was and Could Become

All education is self-education.
R. S. Peters

With the demise of compulsory and bureaucratic styles of formal schooling, Goodman, displaying his eternal trust and optimism in man's future, is hopeful that the functional relationship between "teachers" and learners will develop a moral basis rather than—as occurred in the past—a relationship of power, self-imposed status or authority exercised by a teacher over his charges. The impetus for initiating the learning process in this newly-won relationship is to come directly from the learner himself. As Goodman puts it: "Learning . . . can be discriminating, graceful, and energetic only if the organism itself creates its own structures as it goes along."[90] Under these "desirable" conditions, there is little or no need for extrinsic motivation, and the intrinsic energies and goals of the individual become part of the on-going projects themselves.[91] This enables participants in such activities to adjust freely to their environments and to learn from one another.

The idea of Vocation that Goodman outlines in *Growing Up Absurd* is also *à propos* in this context. Given the moral basis underlying all learning (and living for that matter, because these processes are said to be inseparable functions), the individual begins to feel that he belongs to community life and work, and is also able to fulfil his most pressing personal needs. In addition, he discovers that he is part of the whole societal enterprise rather than an impersonal fragment because he is forever finding worthwhile opportunities and useful chores he can stumble into, and initiate on his own. By so doing, he achieves his own identity.

Evaluated from a pedagogical perspective, Goodman's alternative learning proposals and arrangements are geared not only toward breaking down or substantially reducing the power of formalized schooling (Goodman would retain those schools which function well) over the lives of children, but also to placing a check on the legitimacy or even the necessity for intervention on the part of those who might interfere with learning activities. If teachers were good, however, they would attract learners. Further, society would not need teacher ratings anymore, Goodman assumes, simply because youngsters would bypass poor teachers. In this schema, because they have more freedom of option in learning endeavours, Goodman predicts that it is difficult for learners not to benefit.

In terms of more far-reaching psycho-social gains and considerations, Goodman hopes his educational alternatives will restore the right proportions with respect to man's present interactions with his environment and its institutions.[92] That is why he confidently advocated that what was needed within the existing social order for his alternatives to freely emerge was a reconstruction of values and institutional behaviour, not an entirely new structure to replace formal schooling.[93] In this hope, Goodman was always present-minded: he possessed an unwavering faith in overcoming present trends and in recovering man's past instincts, traditions, and institutions.[94] If successful, he felt his educational proposals may enable man, given his newly-won relationships with other individuals and "real" objects in his community, to possibly raise the improvements within the present order in the direction of founding a new social order, remarkably different, especially in nature and design (though similar to past ones) from the officially-approved, existing one.

Footnotes to Chapter VII

[1] See, e.g., Goodman's *The Community of Scholars* and *Compulsory Mis-Education* (see Appendix I, items 17, 22).

[2] (Review of *New Reformation*), *New Republic*, Vol. 162, May 30, 1970, p. 25 (see Appendix I, item 682).

[3] His position regarding this point, as the concluding section of the previous chapter should reveal, is not entirely clear in much of his writings. On the one hand, he has attacked all formal schooling, yet does not call for its entire abandonment, particularly at the elementary and university levels of schooling. Paradoxically, many of his schemes, as Goodman himself realizes, could simply not be implemented if grafted as appendages onto the schooling process within the present social order. This often led him to take an extreme view when promoting his alternatives, by totally rejecting the idea of schools altogether. (See Goodman's review of Mark van Doren's *Liberal Education*, *Politics*, Vol. 1, No. 2, March 1944, p. 62 (see Appendix I, item 217). Remaining true to this position until his death, Goodman sought to abolish the structure within which much of formal schooling was presently constituted, and allow educational institutions (resembling past forms) to voluntarily emerge.

[4] P. Goodman, "Why Go to School?", *New Republic*, Vol. 149, October 5, 1963, pp. 13-14 (see Appendix I, item 187).

[5] P. Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-Education*, New York: Horizon Press, 1964, p. 141 (see Appendix I, item 22).

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 179-180.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 126

[8] F. Perls, R. Hefferline, and P. Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy—Excitement and Growth in the Human Personality*, New York: Julian Press, 1951, p. 236 (see Appendix I, item 10).

[9] This is a further example of Goodman's goal of restoring the right proportions in the present social order. This goal was referred to in Chapter II.

[10] (Interview concerning *New Reformation*), *Saturday Review*, Vol. 53, May 23, 1970, p. 40 (see Appendix I, item 684).

[11] G. Braziller, (ed.), *Seeds of Liberation*, New York: Horizon Press, 1965, p. 441 (see Appendix I, items 23, 374).

[12] Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-Education*, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

[13] P. Goodman, *Growing Up Absurd—Problems of Youth in the Organized Society*, New York: Vintage Books, 1960, p. 155 (see Appendix I, item 14).

[14] P. Goodman, *The Community of Scholars*, New York: Random House, 1962, p. 174 (see Appendix I, item 17).

[15] M.L. Wax, S. Diamond, and F.O. Gearing, (eds.), *Anthropological Perspectives on Education*, New York: Basic Books, 1971, pp. 118-119.

[16] P. Goodman, "Education and the Seven Arts," *Why?*, Vol. 4, No. 8, January-February 1946, pp. 4-5 (see Appendix I, item 101).

[17] P. Goodman, *New Reformation—Notes of a Neolithic Conservative*, New York: Random House, 1970, p. 191 (see Appendix I, item 33).

[18] Like the late British progressive educator A. S. Neill, Goodman does not agree with compulsory instruction and mandatory attendance at educational institutions. He suggests it is preferable to make all education voluntary because of his belief that no growth to freedom occurs except by intrinsic motivation on the part of the individual himself.

[19] Goodman denies most of the formal bureaucratic status teachers have traditionally held.

[20] P. Goodman, "The Universal Trap," in Daniel Schreiber (ed.), *Profile of the School Dropout*, New York: Vintage Books, 1968, pp. 380-381 (see Appendix II).

[21] P. Goodman, "In Search of Community," *Commentary*, Vol. 29, No. 4, April 1960, pp. 317-318 (see Appendix I, item 149).

[22] D.W. Cox, *The City as Schoolhouse: The Story of the Parkway Programme*, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Judson Press, 1972, p. 163.

[23] Goodman often stressed the fact that this point had also been raised by Sylvia Ashton-Warner in *Teacher* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1963, pp. 87-88).

[24] P. Goodman, "The Present Moment in Education," *Notre Dame Journal of Education*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 1970, p. 27 (see Appendix II).

[25] P. Goodman, "Freedom and Learning," in S. Gorowitz (ed.), *Freedom and Order in the University*, Cleveland, Ohio: Press of Western Reserve University, 1967, p. 38 (see Appendix I, item 442).

[26] P. Goodman, "No Processing Whatsoever," in B. and R. Gross, (eds.), *Radical School Reform*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969, p. 105 (see Appendix II).

[27] This view appears to stem from Goodman's interpretations of the educational activities of the early Greeks, whose primary aim of education, he was wont to declare, was versatility and harmonious development, catering to the growing physical, intellectual, social, moral, religious, and emotional sides of the child's nature.

[28] Wax, Diamond, and Gearing, *Anthropological Perspectives on Education*, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

[29] See, e.g., Sylvia Ashton-Warner's *Spearpoint: Teacher in America*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf Pub., 1972.

[30] P. Goodman, "A Discussion in Toronto," *The New York Review of Books*, Spring 1963 (see Appendix I, item 183).

[31] P. Goodman, "The Duty of Professionals," *Liberation*, Vol. 12, No. 8, November 1967, pp. 36-37 (see Appendix I, item 230).

[32] Goodman, *The Community of Scholars*, *op. cit.*, p. 256.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 127.

[34] Goodman, *Growing Up Absurd*, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

[35] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 258.

[36] See, e.g., the writer's treatment of this idea in Chapter II.

[37] R. Glasgow, "Paul Goodman: A Conversation," *Psychology Today*, November 1971, p. 92 (see Appendix II).

[38] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

[39] For example, Goodman was always skeptical about sociology because he felt it attempted to tabulate the reactions and characteristics of individuals by a process of abstraction, and therefore sought to ignore the real subject of inquiry—the individual. With reference to the activity of sociologists, Goodman once remarked that "there is a good deal of sharpening of tools but not much agriculture." See Goodman's "Freedom and Learning" in Gorowitz, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

[40] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

[41] Goodman, "The Present Moment in Education," *op. cit.*, p. 29.

[42] Goodman, in many respects, idealizes the period of infancy and childhood, and wants to conserve childlike qualities (e.g., spontaneity, fantasy, animality, creativity, innocence) throughout an individual's lifetime, as a natural resource and natural wonder. This ideal, referred to in Chapter II, Goodman derives from the literary themes of Wordsworth, whom he believes to have possessed a similar view of the young.

[43] P. Adams, (ed.), *Children's Rights: Toward the Liberation of the Child*, New York: Praeger Pub., 1971, p. 4 (see the Introduction by Goodman, pp. 1-8, cited in Appendix II).

[44] See, e.g., Goodman's "A Prescription for Mini-Schools" (*Chelsea-Clinton News*, Vol. 26, No. 2, October-November 1967, p. 18); "On Free Schools" (*New Schools Exchange Newsletter*, No. 40, May 1970, p. 3); and "For Mini-Schools—If Any" (*The Urban Review*, Vol. 5, No. 2, November 1971, pp. 2-3). These articles are cited in Appendix I, items 229 and 426; and, Appendix II.

[45] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

[46] Goodman, "The Present Moment in Education," *op. cit.*, p. 28.

[47] Adams, *Children's Rights*, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

[48] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 310.

[49] F. Perls, R. Hefferline, and P. Goodman, "Gestalt Therapy," in J.T. Huber and H.L. Millman (eds.), *Goals and Behaviour in Psychotherapy and Counselling: Readings and Questions*, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Pub. Co., 1972, pp. 90-99.

[50] Goodman often argued that psychotherapy should completely take over the functions of education because the "customary" education in the home, school, university, and church, was inept and not cognizant of children's most pressing needs.

[51] Goodman, "The Universal Trap," in Schreiber, *op. cit.*, p. 378

[52] Goodman, "The Present Moment in Education," *op. cit.*, p. 28.

[53] P. Goodman, *Utopian Essays and Practical Proposals*, New York: Vintage Books, 1962, pp. 18-19 (see Appendix I, item 16).

[54] P. Goodman, *The Empire City*, New York: Macmillan Co., 1964, p. 127 (see Appendix I, item 13).

[55] Paul and Percival Goodman, *Communitas—Means of Livelihood and Ways of Life*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1947, pp. 166-167 (see Appendix I, item 7).

[56] Goodman, "No Processing Whatsoever," in Gross, *op. cit.*, p. 100. Here Goodman embraces once more what he conceives to be Greek styles of educating. He often said (by way of example), when talking about educational alternatives, that Athenian children also played games, sang, and acted Homer. In addition, he mentions that they were frequently taken around the city just to see what was happening.

[57] Paul and Percival Goodman, *Communitas*, *op. cit.*, p. 216.

[58] P. Goodman, "High School is Too Much," *Psychology Today*, Vol. 4, No. 5, October 1970, pp. 25-26 (see Appendix II).

[59] Goodman, "The Universal Trap," in Schreiber, *op. cit.*, p. 378.

[60] Adams, *Children's Rights*, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

[61] Remembering periods in American history, for example, when he believes such a flexible, decentralized set of institutions were freely operating and interlocking to produce a vital, novel, yet exciting learning environment, Goodman is confident that such a climate can be recaptured once again. Lawrence Cremin's *The Genius of American Education* (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburg Press, 1965) expresses a similar viewpoint.

[62] G.K. Smith, (ed.), *New Teaching New Learning*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1971, p. 250.

[63] P. Goodman, "Freedom and Learning: The Need for Choice," *Saturday Review*, May 18, 1968, pp. 73-75 (see Appendix I, item 245).

[64] Wax, Diamond, and Gearing, *Anthropological Perspectives on Education*, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

[65] P. Goodman, "The Education Industry," *Harvard Educational Review*, Winter 1967, p. 109 (see Appendix I, item 231).

[66] Goodman, "No Processing Whatsoever," in Gross, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

[67] Goodman, "The Education Industry," *op. cit.*, p. 108.

[68] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

[69] Paul and Percival Goodman, *Communitas*, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

[70] This belief comes close in nature to the Syndicalist views once propounded by the English socialist G.D.H. Cole.

[71] P. Goodman, *The Society I Live In Is Mine*, New York: Horizon Press, 1963, pp. 130-136 (see Appendix I, item 20).

[72] Goodman, *The Community of Scholars*, *op. cit.*, p. 205.

[73] Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

[74] Goodman, "Freedom and Learning," in Gorowitz, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

[75] P. Goodman, "On the University," *The Centre Magazine*, Vol. 1, No. 2, January 1968, pp. 10-12 (see Appendix I, item 239).

[76] P. Jacobs, and S. Landau, *The New Radicals: A Report with Documents*, New York: Random House, 1966, p. 243.

[77]Goodman, *The Community of Scholars*, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

[78]P. Goodman, *People or Personnel—Decentralizing and the Mixed System*, New York: Random House, 1965, p. 147 (see Appendix I, item 24).

[79]K. Selden, "Administration as the Villain," *Saturday Review*, Vol. 45, December 15, 1962, p. 61 (see Appendix I, item 580).

[80]P. Goodman, "For a Reactionary Experiment in Education," *Harper's Magazine*, Vol. 225, No. 1350, November 1962, pp. 61-62 (see Appendix I, item 178).

[81]P. Goodman, "Thoughts on Berkeley," *New York Review*, January 14, 1965 (see Appendix I, items 201, 439).

[82]D. Calhoun, (ed.), *The Educating of Americans: A Documentary History*, New York: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1969, pp. 607-608; 610.

[83]Paul and Percival Goodman, *Communitas*, *op. cit.*, pp. 108-109.

[84]Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-Education*, *op. cit.*, pp. 123, 150.

[85]Goodman, *The Community of Scholars*, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

[86]*Ibid.*, p. 256.

[87]Goodman, *People or Personnel*, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

[88]*Ibid.*, p. 277.

[89]Goodman, "Freedom and Learning," in Gorowitz, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

[90]Goodman, *New Reformation*, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

[91]Paul and Percival Goodman, *Communitas*, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

[92]Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 236.

[93]This argument is taken up in the following chapter.

[94]P. Goodman, *Five Years—Thoughts During a Useless Time*, New York: Vintage Books, 1969, p. 208 (see Appendix I, item 26).

Chapter VIII

ASSUMPTIONS UNDERLYING GOODMAN'S VIEW OF HUMAN NATURE AND EDUCATIONAL REFORM: ASSESSMENT AND IMPLICATIONS

Restatement of the Thesis

Before attempting the task of adequately assessing and uncovering the implications underlying much of Goodman's thought, including his educational thought, the writer believes it may be profitable to his readers, as well as for himself, to briefly recap the main arguments advanced in this study. The thesis presented is the notion that every aspect of Goodman's thought, and particularly his educational thought, can be traced back or linked to his analysis of human nature.[1] Moreover, the writer wishes to emphasize that Goodman's specific contribution to educational reform, including progressive education reform, is this human nature conception.

The latter concern (given the writer's interests) is the major argument offered here. In pursuit of these claims, therefore, such topics as, e.g., Goodman's intellectual background, his analysis of youth movements, his anarchist ideas, and finally, his educational propositions, have been discussed from the perspective of Goodman's human nature viewpoints and the writer's interpretation of them. When the validity of utilizing such an approach was (hopefully) fully established, the writer subsequently gave close and particular attention to uncovering a firm connecting link between Goodman's views concerning human nature and his educational proposals.[2]

Although his views about human nature, glimpses of which appear here and there in *Gestalt Therapy*, are frequently presented by Goodman himself in piecemeal or fragmented fashion, and are not entirely coherent if evaluated in relation to an overall human nature conception he may have had, the writer has offered what he believes to be Goodman's human nature viewpoints within a relatively unified argument, i.e., as a series of concepts which are intimately connected, and without any tampering or distortion may fit comfortably, if not neatly (particularly by looking at all of Goodman's works, thoughts, and actions), into a thoughtful, wholistic view. If this study has any saving grace of distinctive quality—let alone a *raison d'être*—then this would indeed be it.

Obviously, we must examine all of Goodman's work as a whole—not simply a part of it—to discover his views of human nature, and that is the approach the writer has systematically adopted here. On the other hand, parts of his work (e.g., *Gestalt Therapy*) must be read with respect to the validity, etc., of other parts (e.g., *Compulsory Mis-Education*). Only then can an integrated view of Goodman's conception of human nature be found. Hopefully, the present effort has enabled the writer to offer his readers some small progress in the direction of discovering and formulating such a view.

Assessment and Implications of Goodman's View of Man and Human Nature: Man as he Is, As Opposed to Man as he Could Become or Was

> On the one hand is the traditional view of human nature, "the conception of a free, responsible individual [which] is embedded in our language and pervades our practices, codes and beliefs"; on the other hand is the new and

> strange "viewpoint of science—the conception of man as unfree and irresponsible—whose power and promise have yet to gain equivalent recognition."
>
> B. F. Skinner, *Science and Human Behaviour*

Throughout this study the writer has constantly referred to an analysis of human nature (and two types of man) he believes to be omnipresent or visible in Goodman's works.

One type of individual, resembling man in his present chained condition, is oriented towards the mass, collective, or group. He is conformist, ritualistic, and assimilated to the existing patterns of culture or forms of society. In a sense one could say this modern-type man is entangled in an ironical social situation: he has stolen fire and defied the gods, and now, attempting to build the world in his own best image, and create a totally man-made and man-controlled environment, he confronts disaster. Disaster, of course, occurs when he undergoes remodelling himself so that he may fit the world he is devising. Cast adrift on a sea of anxiety, and far from salvation, both this man and his future are now unfortunately at stake or in jeopardy. He has stolen fire and taught men how to forge and control their lives, but has himself ended up in chains.

A second form of man upon whom Goodman places much of his considerable hope for a future and better world, is oriented towards expressions of man's true or basic nature. He is self-motivated and regulated in his own activities, while being optimistic, loving, and trusting in his relationships with others. He is also aggressive, active, yet individualistic but communal, and nonconformist, in Bohemian kinds of ways.[3]

In many respects, this type of man emerges as a product of Goodman's pleading for a new man (or the recovery of a type of man who lived in days gone by) to overcome the repressed functioning of present-day man. The new man lights fires and shapes iron, and forges a destiny, but he looks out as much for his fellows as he shows concern for his own welfare. This man of the future lives several lives, possesses a many-sided nature, and has a variety of work and communal experiences. He integrates his many experiences into a whole: a single, meaningful life.

Assessment and Implications of Goodman's Overall View of Human Nature: Assumptions Underlying His Conceptions of Man in His Surrounding Environment

Of course, there are various logical reasons why Goodman might choose one type of man as opposed to another to serve in the social order he wishes to implement. Most of these reasons (perhaps four all told) are connected with Goodman's assumptions concerning human nature, and the manner in which he believes human nature can best be fostered within a creative environment.

(i) *Reasons Inherent in Goodman's Conservatism: Assumptions Concerning Man's Past*

> Soon the man-made environment will be able to take care of itself, to interact with itself and with human beings just as did the natural ecology in the time of the hunter. Then men will be free again to range the new wilds, to explore possibilities, to probe, to create. . . .
>
> George Leonard, *Education and Ecstasy*

One of Goodman's chief reasons for choosing a particular type of man is tied up with his idealized account of history and historical happenings, and his unwavering conservatism, including a belief in the worth of man's past traditions and customs. Human nature is depicted by Goodman as a crucial part of this human story—the story of how we as human beings have enriched the humane culture—and here we may perceive some inkling of Goodman's willingness (because he laments that individuals no longer create their culture, but simply mechanically or unconsciously adhere to its fixed patterns and rigid arrangements) to merely preserve or recover a type of man and society he believed functioned effectively in the past.

Frequently, then, Goodman's theories about human nature and its operations often disregard the rise of the Industrial State with its mechanisms and instruments of organized bureaucracies and hardened institutions, and aspire to a time when man was supposedly inventive and free, living in communion with both his fellows and his environment. In Goodman's view, during this period in man's history the individual was born into a world where the cultural modes emanating from and within societies were left open for future growth and further development. In such societies, the humane culture to which Goodman refers was said to have been kept alive by and through the living example of a large number of people who took it seriously, while adding to its achievements, and denigrating or denouncing its failures.

In disclosing this interesting revelation, we should pay particular attention to the fact that Goodman is constantly making reference in his writings to human beings stripped of their modern condition, i.e., men in their primary, pre-industrial communities, fully cognizant of, and dependent on, their animal natures. More seriously, perhaps, this conservative aspect of his human nature appraisals allows Goodman to (perhaps unknowingly) fall into the frequent trap of referring to individuals and their behaviour, as if they or it always existed or functioned since time immemorial in a societal or cultural vacuum, devoid of a surrounding, imposing environment.

Unfortunately, this so-called "desirable" state for man and mankind does not help us forget that bureaucratic organizations presently exist which regulate people's existences and make them lose faith in their abilities (whether or not man was different in the past). Moreover, one could argue that there is no way for individuals to be effective outside the existing dominant system of society and no way in the system (or culture), so people with inventive ideas and initiative become discouraged and either drop out or resign themselves to token performance.[4] Therefore, perhaps a more discerning reader of Goodman's proposals about human nature could reasonably ask: if we survive the present problems in society and the culture can anything quite like we experienced in the past exist again?[5] Clearly, Goodman believed it could. He was romantic enough to suppose that the present social order could be judiciously overcome.[6] To say this, of course, is to foolishly deny the fact that our present "world" is (for better or worse) definitely here to stay.

(ii) *Reasons Implicit in Goodman's Assumptions About the Processes of Growth and Development Within Individuals*

Why can't I take people as they are, as they have been compelled?

Paul Goodman, *Five Years*

Nature has made us sexual animals, but something has made us human beings.

Arnold Toynbee

Man is robbed of trust in his own power of thought.

Albert Schweitzer, *Pilgrimage to Humanity*

A second and further reason why Goodman places so much faith and hope in a certain type of man is connected with his belief concerning the processes of growth and development which take place within individuals. In Goodman's scheme of things relating to man as he could become and once was, this process is not only inferred: it is largely taken for granted. For instance, the idea of growth and development, including individual self-regulation and creative adjustment (i.e., optimum individual-environmental interaction), is totally assumed in *Gestalt Therapy* without preliminary discussion. These assumptions allow Goodman to confidently assert, on the one hand, that spontaneity, imagination, playfulness, and direct expressions of feeling (the products of self-regulation and creative adjustment) are healthy and desirable; and, on the other, that individuals are able, ready, and willing to respond to internal messages or cues, and that their selections are the most personally beneficial and socially responsible ones.

Implicit in Goodman's entire argument from the perspective of man as he is viewed presently is the notion of imposed changes, whereby the individual's impulses are inhibited by forces emanating from within his environment, and his true nature is repressed in its functioning. The product of these situations—such things as habitual deliberateness and excessive dependency in individuals (so-called "traits" of adults)—

are condemned by Goodman as abnormal, neurotic, and irrational.[7] Moreover, the absence of Goodman's kind and style of change, development, or growth within individuals is proclaimed to bring about imperfection, decay, or corruption in individual behaviour:[8] "Our action is compelled and this is a pity, for then it does not have the grace of free choice and divine superfluity, calm, clear, unhurried, and decorative."[9]

Although Goodman's views regarding human nature leave us with a clear picture of what we as human beings perhaps ought to be, and maybe even what we are, the not unreal danger exists—particularly when the process of growth and development is inferred within individuals—that what we as human beings could become develops into a prescriptive form or account of what Goodman really wants us to be, and here we must exercise no small measure of caution when examining his propositions.

(iii) *Optimistic Reasons: Individual Self-Regulation and Favourable Environments*

> At Michigan State University
> The old chaplain said,
> "You're strange. You talk so pessimistically
> and yet your tone—the way you are, proposing
> to change the schools and so—is optimistic.
>
> Paul Goodman, *Hawkweed*

> I expect too much of other people, assuming that they have powers and are failing to use them, which indeed they do not have and cannot.
>
> Paul Goodman, *Five Years*

> Even in a palace it is possible to live well.
>
> Marcus Aurelius

A third reason Goodman plumps for a certain kind of individual focusses upon, on the one hand, the incredible optimism he possessed about the direction human nature would take if the human being is allowed to freely regulate his own interactions and adaptations within the environment; and, on the other, the unswerving confidence he displayed about the "goodness" of man's nature, and the good sense man shows, when he is provided with a healthy, growth-inducing environment. As far as the former belief is concerned, Goodman confronts us with what he terms a "natural" view of human behaviour which implies, and seeks to eagerly promote, more intimate contact with the activities of human beings as Goodman feels they actually are lived by human beings. Individuals merely meet an environment and voluntarily, yet creatively, adjust it and objects within it to themselves.[10] The basis for this belief is definitely Goodman's confidence in the biological adaptiveness of the life process, and the ability of human beings to make themselves (whatever the environment) ever different (and hence, have their natures changed).[11]

As a corollary to his optimistic belief in self-regulated behaviour, Goodman advances a concomitant theory, akin to Rousseau's, that man would be naturally and inevitably "good" (e.g., faithful, honest, humane) if he were not corrupted by society's arrangements. Certainly, the task of preserving this "goodness" within individuals is difficult in the present society, as Goodman himself is quick to realize:

> The task would . . . be immensely easier if we enjoyed
> good social institutions, and conventions that gave

> satisfaction and fostered growth, for then these could be taken as a rough norm of what it means to be a full man in the specific culture. . . . As it is, our institutions are not even "merely" biologically healthy, and the forms of individual symptoms are reactions to rigid social errors.[12]

Thus, in many respects, Goodman merely wishes to improve the state of the existing social order and bring dignity to the lives of people, by locating the individual in his true contexts, and by outlining the best environment in which to nurture man's nature.

Unburdened by a shackling environment, this Rousseauesque kind of individual would be like a flower which is allowed to flourish in a perpetually wild state, or an acorn which grows and develops, by the power of its natural functions,[13] and reaches its full potential as a fine-looking oak, unimpeded or stunted in its progress by unwarranted, corrupting (i.e., external) influences. The message Goodman wants to convey here, of course, is that human beings are reasonable and human nature is good, as long as individuals are provided with an adequate, favourable environment: "Men are not stupid by nature. By working in rigid institutions with crooked purposes even an intellegent animal must make a moron of himself."[14] Therefore, when objects in the individual's environment (both human and material) should intervene to redirect human behavior in directions save the ones in which it desires to go, the reverse holds true as well: when the environment is inadequate or unhealthy, men develop proclivities towards evil acts.[15]

It is perhaps too easy to pose reservations to this perpetual trust Goodman has in man and the subtle workings of his inner nature. Quite often, in fact, it is possible (as iterated earlier) to accuse

Goodman of seeing human nature as he would want it to be, rather than what it is. For instance, the authors of *Gestalt Therapy*, one of whom is Goodman, conclude:

> The question that most obviously strikes the average person is how far in our society and technology, and perhaps in the nature of things, organismic self-regulation is possible, allowable, riskable. We believe immensely more than we now deliberately allow; people can be much brighter and more energetic than they are, and then they would also be shrewder.[16]

This in-built confidence Goodman possesses comes through in his writings to such an extent that we are never really sure where to draw the line between fantasy and reality[17] when attempting to make sense out of his proclamations and assertions about such qualities as, e.g., spontaneity, grace, and good sense in human behaviour.

On the positive side, however, Goodman advances a strong and plausible counter-argument, in answer to the claim from many quarters in society that human beings cannot be trusted to regulate themselves and have free reign in their environments, unguided amidst the complexities of the present civilization, which offers us a simple explanation why individual self-regulation and the provision of a healthy, enticing environment are crucial to the functioning of society and the culture: the health of a society, culture, or civilization, is indivisible from the mental state, psychopathology, and sociality of the individual. Thus, it is not difficult to conclude from this argument, as Goodman himself does, that a person carving his own destiny in an adequate, healthy environment would not tolerate the present society, culture, or civilization as it is, and actively seek to change it. Then, it appears, only through the intensive development of different and unique possibilities in the environment by different and unique individuals, that the human race as a whole can attain its full stature and capability.

(iv) *Pessimistic Reasons: The Engineering of Human Behavior*

> The word has come down from the Dean,
> That with the aid of the Teaching Machine,
> King Oedipus Rex,
> Could have learned about sex,
> Without ever touching the Queen.
>
> E. Hurwitz

> My heart rebels against my generation
> That talks of freedom and is slave to riches,
> And, toiling 'neath each day's ignoble burden
> Boasts of the morrow.
>
> George Santayana

> When I wrote *Brave New World* in 1932, I had no idea how soon so much of it would come true. . . . Already, we're working out most of the techniques for controlling the mind, as I saw them in my book.
>
> Aldous Huxley, interviewed by
> George Leonard, June 1962

Finally, Goodman's selection of a particular type or kind of individual is related to the pessimism he often revealed when referring to the "social engineering" dominant within the existing social order. One of the reasons for his criticisms of formal schooling, for example, was his dread that its compulsory and bureaucratic processes would soon be viewed as a pedagogical fad destined to become the new "iron social orthodoxy" of the present age. Therefore, in many respects, Goodman's views about man and his society can be seen as a protest against certain behavioural and structural approaches in psychology—those operative during the fifties and undergoing a resurgence in the late sixties and early seventies[18]—especially the trend towards a collectivism which Goodman maintained placed constraints as well as limits on men:

> In the "objective" account of human behaviour, the organism is an instrument operated by a kind of remote control. The control may variously be called cause-and-effect relationships, influence of environment, social pressures, or whatever, but, in any case, the organism is regarded as the unconsulted heir to an unasked-for legacy. So strong has become this attitude as to make modern man almost a bystander in his own life. The extent to which he himself produces his own situation . . . is ignored or denied.[19]

Undoubtedly, what Goodman is objecting to here is man's being effortlessly seduced (and his resigning himself) into becoming an impersonal cog in a smoothly-running, dehumanized societal machine. In fact, he often lashed out at the sense of historical inevitability of controls (e.g., obedience to organized, authoritarian rules; mechanical role-playing instead of being; the destruction of community by competition and grade-getting; and, objective knowledge without personal meaning) people were prone to accept in their societies because they were unwilling to struggle politically to control and shape their own environment before it succeeded in shaping them and leading everyone to "1984." When man was overpowered by such strong and imposing controls in his society could he do anything to avoid it? Goodman was assured that he could. In order to rectify man's present societal condition, Goodman sought to use the mass media against itself (i.e., by writing) in an attempt to remove the hierarchies of controllers, and the organizational bases underlying the controlling motives and desires of those in societal undertakings (e.g., public relations, sales promotion, personnel management, and propaganda) which he claimed were operating in directions antithetical to the animal needs of the human species.[20] When or if these external regulations were removed, Goodman was confident human beings would possess the opportunity of choosing to internally regulate and control themselves.[21]

Because he witnessed human beings functioning in a manner which he construed to be at odds with his own notions about human nature, it was then, of course, that Goodman offered us (in opposition to the "human engineering" school of psychology) what he conceived as an original, natural, and undistorted approach to man and his supposed outlook on, and behaviour in, life (an approach relevant to man's thinking, acting, and feeling), and a wholistic view and coherent pattern of man's growth and development. Whether such an approach, view, or pattern, possessed all the attributes Goodman claimed for it—even if this was his primary intent—was disputed earlier. However, to advocate a doctrine of personal freedom which is beyond the reach of externally-controlling techniques has its appeal, and is definitely a viewpoint with which the writer is entirely and unrestrainedly sympathetic. Obviously, we cannot externally control an individual who is able to move about his environment capriciously.

Assessment and Implications of Goodman's Educational Proposals and Recommendations

(i) *The Possibility of Social-Psychological and Political Changes for Individuals*

> The Yahoos were a Species of Animals utterly incapable of Amendment by Precepts or Examples.
>
> Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver's Travels* (1776)

> Mr. Goodman is right in his directives for education. But, are Americans truly interested in becoming human in Mr. Goodman's sense?
>
> Response to Goodman's article "Freedom and Learning: The Need for Choice" (1968)

> How true—when you happen not to be a schoolteacher yourself—how true those oft-quoted lines sound—
>
> Under a cruel eye outworn
> The little ones spend the day
> in sighing and dismay!
>
> But when you yourself are the cruel eye outworn, you realise that there is another side to the picture.
>
> George Orwell, *The Clergyman's Daughter*

Goodman's humanistic and libertarian schemes in education are geared to changing or seeing people as dramatically different from what they presently are. Moreover, Goodman proposes that if people can change or alter their own behaviour, they can change the society of which they are a part. In suggesting that man could become different from what he now is, or even return to what he once was, Goodman is trying desperately to narrow the gap between what he feels people ought to be like, and sadly, are like in the present society. Quite often, and mostly in *Gestalt Therapy*, we are never quite sure that Goodman's hypotheses about what people could be like (e.g., spontaneous) are advanced as empirical claims about what people always were, and because of their "humanness", are. Perhaps this is because Goodman's assumptions about people are sometimes disguised as prescriptions concerning their behavioural dispositions, enabling him to jump elegantly from hypothesis to empirical pronouncement, like a conductor harmoniously synchronizing the many and various sections of his orchestra.[22]

Apart from the dubiousness of some of his claims about the functioning of individuals, it is perhaps also naive of Goodman to suggest, as he so often optimistically does, that human nature can be changed merely by an alteration in people's behaviours and functions. When one recalls how successfully the process of formal schooling functions in our societies, this is an extremely difficult venture as anyone who has read Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (fictional, yet highly realistic) will tell you. One of its more telling parables deserves restatement:

> The Lilliputians are of the Opinion . . . that Parents are the last of all others to be trusted with the Education of their own Children: And therefore they have in every Town publick Nurseries, where all Parents, except Cottagers and Labourers, are obliged to send their Infants of both Sexes to be reared and educated when they come to the Age of Twenty Moons; at which Time they are supposed to have some Rudiments of Docility.[23]

Addressing ourselves specifically (with this argument at the fore) to Goodman's educational proposals and recommendations, we would need to change the mentality of people with regard to the schooling process (i.e., especially their thoughts about, and approaches to, educating), before they themselves could change their behaviour or functions. Viewed from this standpoint, Goodman's educational proposals would require personality reconstructions or behavioural changes in learners and "teachers" (viz. Paolo Freire's shift in consciousness). And, keeping in mind the massive sea of humanity beyond the classroom door Goodman is addressing, we should (to throw Goodman's own phraseology back in his face) need to restore in the environment "objects" (both human and material) which enable man to live out his humanity, and at least then he may constructively fashion a good environment out of a malfunctioning one.[24]

(ii) *The Possibility of Instituting Social and Cultural Changes*

> Let us not make the mistake of thinking that . . . a boy would be subservient, would conform to society just because it was his very own. On the contrary! If out of the darkness of original desire should come to him a little hint, he would unrestrainedly blow the fabric of society to smithereens. And so one day Horatio, playing on The Grand Piano—for society is like a grand piano and also like a mechanical piano—one day he had wired the key B Flat to a stick of dynamite: and he played a song leading to touch this key.
>
> Paul Goodman, *The Grand Piano*

> Drugs nor isolation will cure this cancer.
> It is now or never, the hour of the knife.
> The break with the past, the major operation.
>
> C. Day Lewis

Although Goodman formulates principles for alternative institutional arrangements and alternative emphases in the conception of learning in our societies, we may not necessarily assume that he is also suggesting principles for a radical alteration in political and economic values and behaviour. In fact, it is possible to attack Goodman and others for believing education can be used as a lever to change the present society and its culture.

Clearly, only wide-ranging changes in society and its culture will satisfy the varying human natures of individuals, so that they may grow up and be educated freely. When this point is highlighted by Goodman[25] it is the most optimistic and realistic part of his scheme[26] —perhaps more realistic than having people change themselves and their behaviour. However, in order to do this, a major upheaval in the present society is obviously necessary. Therefore, Goodman's schemes for reforming society and its schools, and thereby releasing the human nature of the individual could not be conceived without the prior or preliminary political awakening of society—in the form of a huge revamping of the functions of individuals and the abolishing of institutions—a proposition Goodman only barely accepts and appreciates.[27]

To be perfectly unrealistic, and even momentarily optimistic, about the need for revolutionary change, however, we could predict that civilization may be reaching a moment in time, as many have suggested, where the basic educational alternatives Goodman has foremost in mind lie (as far as the possibility of implementation is concerned) somewhere between this sweeping revolution, as opposed to narrow reform, and willful self-destruction.[28]

If, on the one hand, this radical restructuring of education was to follow in the wake of, or parallel, a vast restructuring in society and the culture, the practical thrust for an educational revolution would come about, not only through changing the perceptions of individuals (offering them more psycho-social, political, and pedagogical freedom) within the present social order, but also by allowing new educational functions and educational institutions to naturally and freely emerge (especially the provision of more decentralized educational opportunities)[29]—and Goodman rightly acknowledges these educational changes, if not the others. In fact, his arguments are particularly strong when they do not abstract man's normal functioning from his natural environment (even accounting for his chained condition) when discussing the necessity for man's changing his own behaviour. Within the new (or merely rediscovered) social order and creative environment in which this educational restructuring would be incorporated, youth (in Goodman's scheme) would have no difficulty in growing up in their societies. At the same time, childhood would be a period full of objective and worthwhile environmental activities. Vocation could be easily acquired. And, more hopefully, perhaps, Goodman's new (or past) "whole" community would be created.

On the other hand, if this political and educational restructuring should not be forthcoming, or should not occur *in toto*, of one thing we can be sure: as long as concentrated economic power determines how change is to proceed, as it does at present, the most radical and rational ideas, including Goodman's,[30] can be assimilated to the most irrational purposes (e.g., so-called increased "humanness" in such areas as counselling can serve to maximize and strengthen schooling). Moreover, there is the real danger, which Goodman (gratefully) recognizes,[31] that administrators will accept only educational innovations, in the form of packaged alternatives, as can best be incorporated into the dominant educational structures of society without substantially altering or affecting them.[32] As Goodman acknowledges this problem:

> It is only by the usual technical and organisational procedures that anything can be accomplished. But with these procedures, and the motives and personalities that belong to them, fresh initiative is discouraged and fundamental change prevented.[33]

Thus, in light of the reservations Goodman (and the writer) possesses regarding the possibility of successfully implementing change within the present social order, the administration of 4,000 Goodmanesque mini-schools poses as many or more bureaucratic problems as the organization of 150 elementary schools under the existing school structures.

Unfortunately, perhaps, Goodman appreciates this fact without fully realizing its humanistic and environmental ramifications.

If society has to be reconstituted before education can become a viable human enterprise, as it should, or, if the school system has to be disestablished, as well it may, it is easy to dismiss Goodman as a hopeless "Romantic" (in pejorative terms, "soft-headed"), simply because he does himself an injustice by failing to acknowledge the serious implications of his own proposals. To be fair to Goodman, however, given the fact that schools have been ascribed overwhelming power in our societies, we must bear in mind the sheer difficulty of successfully accomplishing such a Herculean feat.[34] Especially in regard to the issue of the probability of checking or overcoming the ever-increasing bureaucratic operations of the existing educational structures, to safeguard the rights of people, Goodman certainly deserves the last word:

> A direct solution of social problems disturbs too many fixed arrangements. Society either does not want such solutions, or society is not up to them—it comes to the same thing. The possibility of a higher quality of experience arouses distrust rather than enthusiasm. People must be educated slowly. On the other hand, the only way to educate them, to change the present tone, is to cut through habits, especially the character-defense of saying "nothing can be done" and withdrawing into conformity and privacy. We must prove by experiment that direct solutions are feasible.[35]

(iii) *The Possibility of Effecting Any Meaningful Changes*

> Like the jurymen in Alice in Wonderland, parents and children are bewildered by claims and counterclaims. They are stunned by invitations to follow this or that course, for this or that important reason. Like the jurymen they say "Important" and "Unimportant" without knowing why they said it.
>
> Jacques Barzun, *Teacher in America*

In posing more widespread (and hence, less specific) reservations about Goodman's educational recommendations and proposals, the conclusion can be drawn that Goodman, whether suggesting that individuals should change their behaviour or institutions their functions, proposes reform not revolution (political, or otherwise) as a cure for man's present problems with formal schooling and with society.[36] A Goodmanesque reform without revolution means that the economic and political institutions of today, and, for that matter, of the sixteenth century (which gave rise to them), while profoundly affected in the ensuing struggle, come through almost unscathed. In this sense, Goodman advocates a purging of old societal forms and structures, rather than their replacement by something new and different. Throughout *New Reformation*, for instance, he argues that if a basic reform of the existing university structure and the remainder of the educational system is achieved, political revolution is unnecessary. For this reason, Goodman has often been roundly chided[37] for offering us piecemeal solutions, and for possessing a liking in his reforms for harmless tinkering (viz., a bit here, a bit there).[38]

Goodman's free and open society, then, does not involve the dramatic substitution of a new order for an old order;[39] it is the piecemeal extension of spheres of free action by individuals within the existing society until these spheres make up most, if not all, of the social life Goodman deems as desirous for the order which is yet to be created.[40] For example, in *Seeds of Liberation* Goodman informs us:

> [The] future . . . will be more leisurely . . . ; and the leisure . . . will include much more community and

> civic culture; there will be more employment in human services and less in hardware gadgets; there will be more citizenly initiative and less regimentation; and there will be decentralization of control and administration in many spheres.[41]

Employing this therapeutic approach, Goodman is like a man for all seasons, exhorting the organized bureaucracies to give up their psychology of power,[42] attempting to hold the university to its real purpose (by the institution of seminars at Columbia),[43] and urging the community to correct its past failures, misses and compromises in the hope of constructing the ideal society.[44]

In Goodman's view, this reformist attitude and approach towards change is safest and unlikely to produce ruinous consequences.[45] Such reformist zeal notwithstanding, Goodman makes the need for revolution—not the actuality itself—the basis of political agitation and activism. When there is almost a total lack of practical will to make the necessary reorganization of society because people simply do not take the powers in command within the present society as a serious threat, and because it is extremely difficult for people to formulate positive, idealistic images of the future when they are enmeshed in a psychological web, this policy is a good way to defeat even the possibility of meaningful reform (let alone the possibility of successful revolution). The trouble—which Goodman correctly diagnoses in *The Empire City*—is that people have already conformed so much to a "mad" or "absurd" society[46] that they cannot see the need for (much less the actuality of) political revolution, and even if they do, the situation has become such within their societies that they are now too powerless to alter it.[47]

Attaining the Impossible Dream

Ah, My Beloved, fill the cup that clears,
To-day of past regrets and future fears;
To-morrow!—Why to-morrow I may be
Myself with yesterday's sev'n thousand years.

The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam

Be ashamed to die until you have won some victory for humanity.

Horace Mann (1859)

Many writers and experts suggested the Old Régime was doomed and must soon collapse; yet not a single man foretold that there would be a mighty revolution.

De Tocqueville

When we think that the possible is impossible, we begin to imagine that the impossible is possible.

Goethe

All the great revolutions in men's lives are made in thought. When a change takes place in man's thought, action follows the directions of the thought as a ship follows the direction of the rudder.

Leo Tolstoy

Particularly with respect to his contribution to educational reform in twentieth century North America, Goodman's humane proposals cannot be dismissed, discounted, or downgraded. When highlighting Goodman's contribution, his awareness about, and positive challenge to, all formal schooling from an idiosyncratic conception of human nature, until its total rejection by those who came later (e.g., the "deschoolers"), should not be downplayed. Of course, Goodman's message here was not new: he was largely chasing truths that had been chased before.[48] With Goodman's entrance onto the educational scene in the sixties, the tenor and content of the criticism changed, but the underlying theme or social message regarding the schooling process was still the same:[49] the control of youthful enthusiasm by a bureaucratized and rigidified formal school system.

Goodman's second contribution to educational reform shows less of a willingness to follow in the footsteps of others. In fact, his speculations about alternatives (from the same human nature vantage point), through construction in detail of possible programmes, to the evangelical popularization of one such programme as a basis for common agreement about a new social order[50] which is yet to appear, surpass by far the work of most educators—including Illich, Reimer, Friedenberg, and Henry—and give some indication of where Goodman's inventive capabilities lie. Beside his contributions to the debate concerning alternatives to schooling,[51] the output of current educators appears either flaccid or dull. Certainly, there is no educator since the demise of Dewey whose contribution to this debate has been so wide-ranging and unified, primarily because Goodman was more intellectually sophisticated and convincing than most about human nature (especially those of its characteristics related to the quality of being and feeling in persons), and more effective with his proposals concerning alternative institutional settings and forms. Because of their unique appeal, Goodman's alternative proposals for educational reform were able to adequately fill the void remaining in educational criticism (though not educational practice) by the failure of a progressive education philosophy to take root in American society.[52]

Despite the fact that a basic need still exists today for a political movement which can offset the power of organized bureaucracies and educational industries, and for the institution of a social setting in which Goodmanesque ideas can be placed in the service of revolutionary ideals, we should not overly penalize Goodman for side-stepping a social revolution which he personally did not know how to instigate.[53] Such a social revolution would require as its catalyst a problem of almost religious depth and metaphysical significance. It would also require as its base a catastrophe that rocks people, or a prophetic voice which stimulates individuals to think in terms other than pure speculation about social problems, and beyond the psychology that nothing can be done.

Although Goodman possessed the latter quality, he was as he essentially put it, "no political animal." It was therefore impossible for him, despite his considerable powers, to breathe an air of solidarity into an effective political action group (compared to Saul Alinsky with his social action groups) in American society. Who would join it? The New Left formed the basis of an adult movement, but their efforts fizzled out by the late sixties. Moreover, in the mid-sixties, the youth took over the movements for social change and civil liberties when their elders defaulted. Obviously, Goodman's radical alternatives to schooling (and other institutional spheres in society) demanded that society and its constituents possess the political opportunity and the moral fibre to carry his reforms through. Few individuals, then or since, would pay the price of salvation. Most have dissociated themselves from the struggle, and largely suppressed their ideals.

With the attainment of an effective social revolution a remote possibility for the future, Goodman's highest and most stimulating function was perhaps as a constructive nay-sayer: by his indignant, sardonic, and often devastatingly accurate assaults on specific examples of obtuseness in American life and American culture he did at least evoke guilt-pangs within educational circles[54] concerning the conscious need for educational and social change as a prelude to further educational action or activity (e.g., the need for psycho-social change in individuals; the need for individuals to redefine their goals; the need for the norms and values of the culture to be revamped; the need to rediscover former, disfavoured goals; and, the need to reverse the course of history from a path of technological determinism). By addressing himself to such crying needs, Goodman hoped to tap any dissent visible within the existing society, so that change would emanate as a ripple or cumulative effect from it. In this fashion, he hoped his ideas would inspire others to do something, or arouse their consciousness as a primer to counter activity.

In a recent tribute to Goodman, Bernard Vincent, while showing its demerits, perceptively describes this incessant hope Goodman embraced until his untimely death:

> We can first of all reproach Goodman, especially when his suggestions go beyond the level of the individual and refer to the group and to the city, for not showing us the political means by which his utopias could become part of reality. There is a certain naiveté in wanting to change society or the world by an idea alone without mobilising a militant group which can impose it. But Goodman was neither a Leninist or a party man. From 18th century France, from Voltaire, and from Rousseau, he had undoubtedly learned that a strong idea always finds its way into the minds of men, and that if that idea is revolutionary, revolution is ineluctible. This is why, questioning himself on the fate of his work, Goodman was haunted until his death by the fear of being forgotten.[55]

Although education, if not formal schooling, appears headed for a gloomy and uncertain future, we would be remiss as educators if we did not proceed further into this decade of the seventies without attempting to kindle a slight spark or glimmer of optimism about the possibility of effecting revolutionary changes in education and society through the cumulative efforts of individuals. Like the New Yorkers who watched from behind their blinds while a woman was stabbed to death, can we remain uninvolved? There is promise and prospects for revolution if we are willing to take the step.[56] This means we have to accept the criticism of people such as Goodman if we believe it, and cheerfully continue his work. If we adopt this attitude, maybe there is still some hope, recalling the words of Robert Kennedy when he said: "Some men see things as they are and ask 'Why?'; I dream of things that never were and say, 'Why not?'"[57]

Footnotes to Chapter VIII

[1] In addressing himself to this particular argument raised by the writer in a personal communication, George Dennison reveals (correspondence dated July 12, 1973) in similar vein:

> Educational reform cannot be separated from (for instance) the political and economic ideas implicit in the general idea of decentralization. And this idea, in turn, has much to do with the ideas of autonomy and self/environment found in *Gestalt Therapy*; and these ideas are essential to an understanding of anarchism. And so on. All this is absolutely essential in dealing with Goodman. I mean this unity of thought.

[2] According to Bernard Vincent (correspondence dated October 1, 1973), who is writing a doctoral thesis at the Sorbonne, Paris, on Goodman's utopian views, this human nature approach is valid when applied to all of Goodman's thought:

> [He] spoke the forgotten language of human nature and, so doing, woke up sleeping dogs. His views regarding human nature are essential to all Paul Goodman wrote and all he did. Hence the importance of [Robert] Meredith's [forthcoming] book [*Culture Against Nature*].

[3] In this sense one could christen Goodman a devotee of that American cult of experience including Ernest Hemingway, E. E. Cummings, Henry Miller, Scott Fitzgerald, John Steinbeck, and the entire Beat Generation (including Jack Kerouac and Alan Ginsberg).

[4] P. Goodman, "Notes on Decentralisation," *Dissent*, Vol. 11, No. 4, Autumn 1964, pp. 389-403 (see Appendix I, item 200).

[5] P. Goodman, *Growing Up Absurd—Problems of Youth in the Organized Society*, New York: Vintage Books, 1960, pp. 230-231 (see Appendix I, item 14).

[6] S. Lynd, "If Not Now, When?", *Liberation*, Vol. 7, No. 4, June 1962, pp. 17-21 (see Appendix I, item 697).

[7] F. Perls, R. Hefferline, and P. Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy—Excitement and Growth in the Human Personality*, New York: Dell Pub. Co., 1951, p. 251 (see Appendix I, item 10).

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

[9] P. Goodman, *Five Years—Thoughts During a Useless Time*, New York: Vintage Books, 1969, pp. 62-63 (see Appendix I, item 26).

[10] One important educational outcome of this view is the reliance on intrinsic motivation or "free"discipline, a withdrawal of teachers

from a position of authority, and the rejection of a planned or packaged curriculum in favour of a wide range of "elective" studies or activities (see Chapters VI and VII).

[11] The logic for Goodman's belief in this respect is to be found in the works of Erik Erikson, and particularly Herbert Marcuse's *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1966.

[12] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 309.

[13] This view is similar to those expressed by Engels and frequently, Pestalozzi. See, e.g., the quotation (cited from the works of the latter) contained in Chapter VII.

[14] P. Goodman, *People or Personnel—Decentralizing and the Mixed System*, New York: Random House, 1965, p. 19 (see Appendix I, item 24).

[15] Such a view is an important foundation for Goodman's anarchistic ideas (discussed in Chapter IV). One result of Goodman's distrust of individuals within the present, "unhealthy" social order is his desire to disperse the functions of men in society, so that power does not concentrate in the hands of a few individuals.

[16] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

[17] Perhaps this is because these qualities such as grace, initiative, etc.— qualities often evident in Goodman's assessment of individuals and their behaviour—appear "grey" and "fuzzy," and hence, difficult to prove empirically.

[18] B. F. Skinner and his books *Science and Human Behaviour* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1953) and *The Technology of Teaching* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968) were supposedly the culprits here.

[19] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

[20] Many of these points were raised in Chapter IV.

[21] Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy*, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-20.

[22] M. Wright, *The New Left: A Conversation with Paul Goodman*, North Stratford, New Hampshire: Cornell University Library, July 21, 1968, p. 8 (see Appendix II).

[23] P. Pinkus, (ed.), *Jonathan Swift: Gulliver's Travels*, Toronto: Macmillan Co., 1965, pp. 60-61.

[24] P. Goodman, "The Social Format: City Crowds," *Politics*, Vol. 3, No. 11, December 1946, pp. 390-391 (see Appendix I, item 104).

[25] Goodman, *Growing Up Absurd*, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

[26] P. Goodman, *Adam and His Works*, New York: Vintage Books, 1969, p. 15 (see Appendix I, item 30).

[27] P. Goodman, "The Education Industry," *Harvard Educational Review*, Winter 1967, p. 110 (see Appendix I, item 231).

[28] See, e.g., Everett Reimer's *School is Dead: Alternatives in Education*, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1971.

[29] M. Katz, "The Present Moment in Educational Reform," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 41, No. 3, 1971, pp. 342-359.

[30] Goodman termed his own ideas "conservative."

[31] Goodman, *Five Years*, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

[32] For this reason in particular, it was possible for the writer to argue in Chapter V, as he has suggested Goodman has done in his writings, that it was the organizational reforms (e.g., the provision of supervisory functions within schools, and the drive for efficiency in school activities), not the promotion of long-awaited revolutionary changes (e.g., the freedom of learners to initiate their own educational endeavours) which were most representative of the progressive education spirit in actual practice.

[33] P. Goodman, *Utopian Essays and Practical Proposals*, New York: Vintage Books, 1962, p. xi (see Appendix I, item 16).

[34] The late Jules Henry provides us with an appealing argument in support of this contention. He suggests it is impossible to maintain an "organised" system if everyone is enlightened and in control of their own educational activities and learning structures. In addition, he maintains stupidity, vulnerability, and failure are "socially necessary" for the survival of the existing educational system. See, e.g., Henry's *Jules Henry on Education*, New York: Random House, 1971.

[35] P. Goodman, "The Ineffectuality of Some Intelligent People," *Commentary*, Vol. 33, No. 6, June 1962, p. 484 (see Appendix I, item 172).

[36] N. Hentoff, "The Legacy of Paul Goodman," *Change*, Vol. 4, No. 10, Winter 1972/73, pp. 38-47 (see Appendix II).

[37] James Cass has argued recently that this superficial tinkering in educational circles is not sufficient today. See, e.g., his "Pressures for Change," *Saturday Review*, Vol. 54, No. 47, November 20, 1971, p. 77.

[38] This piecemeal approach of Goodman's was briefly touched upon in Chapters IV and VII.

[39] J. Ellerby, "The World of Paul Goodman," *Anarchy*, January 1962, pp. 4-6 (see Appendix I, item 690).

[40] This point, argued by Goodman in *Art and Social Nature*, was also extrapolated upon in Chapter IV.

[41] Braziller, *Seeds of Liberation*, *op. cit.*, p. 496.

[42] P. Goodman, "Extreme Situation," *New Republic*, Vol. 149, October 19, 1963, p. 7 (see Appendix I, item 188).

[43] P. Goodman, "Columbia's Unorthodox Seminars, *Harper's Magazine*, Vol. 228, No. 1364, January 1964, pp. 72-82 (see Appendix I, item 193).

[44] P. Goodman, "The Face-to-Face Community," *Liberation*, Vol. 5, No. 3, May 1960, pp. 13-14 (see Appendix I, item 150).

[45] P. Goodman, *New Reformation—Notes of a Neolithic Conservative*, New York: Random House, 1970, pp. 192-193 (see Appendix I, item 33).

[46] Goodman would largely agree with Camus, e.g., who believed it was important for the smooth-running of society that people learned to be absurd, to be idiotic.

[47] P. Goodman, *The Empire City*, New York: Macmillan Co., 1964, p. 407 (see Appendix I, item 13).

[48] As early as the 1920's John Dewey decried meaningless school activities for denying the youthful generation a chance to map out a future for society. See, e.g., Dewey's *Human Nature and Conduct*, New York: Henry Holt, 1922. His message, though perhaps dated, is still appropriate here:

> When we think of the docility of the young we first think of the stores of information adults wish to impose and the way of acting they want to reproduce. Then we think of the insolent coercions, the insinuating briberies, the pedagogic solemnities by which the freshness of youth can be faded and its vivid curiosities dulled. Education becomes the art of taking advantage of the helplessness of the young; the forming of habits becomes a guarantee for the maintenance of hedges of customs (p. 64).

[49] If, indeed, it is true that school criticism had been a national pastime for Americans long before the advent of Goodman to this particular function, it is fair to argue that there must surely be a reason why the criticism still lies unabated, and the message is only vaguely heeded (see the writer's Epilogue).

[50] This kind of social order also compares favourably with a form of pre-industrial society where man engaged in co-operative activities (see Chapter II).

[51] These alternatives to schooling have been given fair and extensive treatment in Chapter VII.

[52] This argument was presented in Chapter V, and originally proposed in Chapter II.

[53] Most Utopian reformers, and Goodman was no exception, have personal blueprints for the future. Of course, what Goodman clearly lacked was the practical bent towards solving educational problems which the early Dewey and the late A. S. Neill undoubtedly possessed.

[54] However, Goodman failed to realize that without a prior political revolution in American society, the educational system could continually co-opt or swamp his searing criticisms by merely agreeing with them. Unfortunately, this did not happen to Goodman alone (see, e.g., the writer's Epilogue).

[55] B. Vincent, "Discovering Paul Goodman," *Esprit*, 19 April, 1973, p. 10 (see Appendix II).

[56] Of course many of us are not; we are comfortable careerists, content to shuffle through a social system whose inequities we have barely or not fully experienced.

[57] The statement was originally attributed to George Bernard Shaw. Edward Kennedy restated it in the oration at his brother's funeral.

EPILOGUE[1]

> I don't know, Ma'am, why they make all this fuss about education.
>
> Lord Melbourne to Queen Victoria

> Not only is education under fire; the practice of criticizing our schools is well on the way to becoming a national pastime.
>
> Mary Anne Raywid, *The Axegrinders*

> "Whom are you?" said he, for he had been to night school. "I am nicely."
>
> Oliver Wendell Holmes, Letter
> announcing his arrival in New York
> from England, 15 December, 1875.

> I think about my education sometimes. I went to the university of Chicago. . . . At that time they were teaching that there was absolutely no difference between anybody. They may be teaching that still.
>
> Kurt Vonnegut, Jr., *Slaughterhouse Five*

In *The Empire City* by Paul Goodman the precocious hero, Horatio, wanders around the city of New York learning to read from the newspapers and gaining all the knowledge of the city—economics, psychology, trades, physical environment, social structures, and so forth—through observation and interaction with the people, even choosing for himself teachers in characters whom he wishes to emulate. Later in the book, one of Horatio's teachers describes a regular programme of education of this sort:

> A school where you never go into a school. There's no building, no special subjects to learn and no teacher. . . . You see, if from the beginning they put you in a building and separate you from the world you are supposed to study, then they have to bring the things back inside again and that's the teacher; and since he can't bring it all in, he makes a convenient selection, and those are the subjects.[2]

Because of his beliefs and feelings about the manner in which school affairs and undertakings are presently conducted, it is easy for the writer to discover himself in complete agreement with Goodman concerning the foregoing. Thus, it is only fair to acknowledge that Goodman's insights have sharpened the writer's perceptions regarding the present functioning of our formal schools and social system, and added coherence where there originally was little to his previously confused and ill-formed notions about the alternative possibilities available not only for our educational future, but also for the entire future of mankind. On the other hand, like most of us, the writer does not find it difficult to frequently argue a point of view with Goodman, as the concluding chapter of this study reveals.

Until fairly recently the writer had been a quite firm believer in the mythological benefits which accrue to individuals through extensive formal schooling, and ironically, one of its staunchest defenders. However, in 1969, and more especially in the summer of 1972 while the writer was in Toronto, he was able to speak with a few people (e.g., Jordan Bishop, David Livingstone, and Michael Katz) whom you might say are at the hub of revolutionary and reformist movements opposed to formal schooling (viz., the posing of alternatives to the schooling process), and as a result of this contact the writer became determined to attack and abolish the schooling industry in an attempt to induce parallel changes in other societal spheres. In this regard, Jordan Bishop (a close friend of Ivan Illich) who is now at Xavier College, Nova Scotia, was particularly helpful; in fact, he afforded the writer a perfect opportunity to view private materials (whose contents were eagerly devoured) related to the research and writings of Everett Reimer and Illich, co-founders of the Centro Intercultural de Documentación (CIDOC) located in Cuernavaca, Mexico. One practical outcome of this perusal was the emergence of a lengthy manuscript completed during the writer's period of academic internship at the University of Alberta.[3]

Although criticizing the schools is suffering a rebirth or a renaissance, a word of caution is directed to all who may sincerely seek to actively promote (from whichever quarter they may wish to proceed) educational changes. Criticizing formal schooling has become, to use Katz's phrase, a "new orthodoxy," and the entire deschooling movement, including the implementation beyond the classroom door of promising educational alternatives, has been successfully (although perhaps exhaustively, and even boringly) anthologized.

What we have presently is no new alternatives in education emerging as a result of criticism by educators, but simply old-style schooling repackaged for popular consumption. In this respect it is truly amazing how the mass media has been able to channel (or swamp society with) potentially "subversive" alternatives to formal schooling (such as community-action style education and incidentally-based societal projects) towards socially desirable goals, and thereby diffuse their message or ideological impact. Therefore, as soon as an idea (such as the seeking of viable alternatives in education) is popularized, it is left open to abuse and misinterpretation (as was Deweyan progressivism). Obviously, if the dominant formal school structures and their functionaries continue to wreak their will in society, and if contemporary critics of schooling continue to be co-opted by the media or organizations which support the very institutions they are attempting to replace, the momentum already gained for the radical movement in education will surely soon be lost.

One example of this co-opting tendency on the part of the media (the list which could be compiled appears endless) is the spate of books[4] (now published, or in press) attempting, on the one hand, to salvage the schools, and yet, on the other, to appease those who seek viable alternatives in education. A recent example is Anne and John Bremer's *Open Education: A Beginning*.[5] Some of the chapter headings in this book are sufficient in themselves to illustrate the accommodation they are seeking with contemporary critics and criticisms of schooling: e.g., Chapter 7, School without lessons; Chapter 8, School without classes; Chapter 9, School without classrooms; Chapter 10, School without walls or classes without a school. Undoubtedly, the next step will be a school without teachers and students, but we shall probably never be confronted with the possibility of no schools at all!

To provide yet another example, Neill Postman and Charles Weingartner in *Teaching as a Subversive Activity*,[6] not only want students to be on their own, they want to eliminate all tests and testing, subject requirements, full time administrators and administrations, and all restrictions that confine or shackle learners to classrooms. Conspicuously absent from their list of things to be eliminated are professional teachers and school buildings, even though, if their suggestions were carried out and the learners did everything on their own, there would be no need for teachers or schools!

In light of these reservations the writer possesses concerning the direction he believes current school criticism and debate is taking us, the time may well be at hand, if not overdue, for calling a moratorium on further educational proclamations. Educators should now disavow themselves from the function of providing instant (i.e., packaged) solutions to formal schooling in case their remedies merely become facile appendages to the present system. Then it is hoped, this period of incipient probing for alternative solutions to formal schooling and of idle provocation within and without formal school structures may (willy-nilly) run its course.

Footnotes to Epilogue

[1] A slightly condensed, more modified, version of this epilogue was presented at a staff-student seminar conducted in the Department of Educational Foundations, University of Alberta, on the 26th October, 1972.

[2] Quoted in K. Ryan and J. Cooper (eds.), *Kaleidoscope: Readings in Education*, New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1972, p. 257.

[3] See, e.g., *Schools and Schooling as Instruments of the Social Control of Individuals: A Plea for Alternatives in Education*, unpublished paper, Department of Educational Foundations, University of Alberta, January 1973, 76 pp. Portions or extended versions of the writer's paper have recently appeared as individual articles.

[4] Michael Katz in his review of B. and R. Gross' (eds.) *Radical School Reform* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969) provides an obvious example of this practice—the Gross' book. Another (closer to home) instance is the recent effort by H. Stevenson, R. Stamp, and J. Wilson, *The Best of Times, The Worst of Times: Contemporary Issues in Canadian Society*, Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

[5] A. and J. Bremer, *Open Education: A Beginning*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

[6] N. Postman and C. Weingartner, *Teaching as a Subversive Activity*, New York: Delacorte Press, 1969.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Adams, F.C., and Stephens, C.W. *College and University Student Work Programmes*, Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois Press, 1970.

Allen, F.R. *Socio-cultural Dynamics: An Introduction to Social Change*, New York: Macmillan Co., 1971.

Archambault, R.D., (ed.). *Dewey on Education: Appraisals*, New York: Random House, 1966.

Ashton-Warner, S. *Teacher*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1963.

Ashton-Warner, S. *Spearpoint: Teacher in America*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972.

Ashworth, K.H. *Scholars and Statesmen*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.

Bagley, W. *Education and Emergent Man*, New York: T. Nelson and Sons, 1934.

Barzun, J. *Teacher in America*, Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1945.

Belth, M. *The New World of Education*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970.

Berman, R. *America in the Sixties: An Intellectual History*, New York: The Free Press, 1968.

Best, J.H., (ed.). *The American Legacy of Learning: Readings in the History of Education*, New York: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1967.

Binder, F.M. *Education in the History of Western Civilization: Selected Readings*, Toronto: Macmillan Co., 1970.

Bishop, J. *Schools Under Fire: The Success and Failure of an Ideology: A Survey of Radical Critique of Education in the 60's*, Cuaderno, Mexico: Centro Intercultural de Documentación, 1971.

Blau, J.L. *Men and Movements in American Philosophy*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1952.

Blaug, M. *An Introduction to the Economics of Education*, London: The Penguin Press, 1970.

Bottomore, T.B. *Critics of Society: Radical Thought in North America*, New York: Pantheon Books, 1968.

Bowers, C. *The Progressive Educator and the Depression: The Radical Years*, New York: Random House, 1969.

Bowers, C., Housego, I., and Dyke, D. (eds.), *Education and Social Policy: Local Control of Education*, New York: Random House, 1970.

Brameld, T. *The Climactic Decades: Mandate to Educate*, New York: Praeger Pub., 1970.

Brameld, T. *Patterns of Educational Philosophy*, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1971.

Bremer, A., and Bremer, J. *Open Education: A Beginning*, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1972.

Broudy, H.S., and Palmer, J.R. *Exemplars of Teaching Method*, Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965.

Brucker, R.M. *Wakan: The Spirit of Harold Benjamin*, Minneapolis, Minnesota: Burgess Pub. Co., 1968.

Butts, R.F., and Cremin, L. *A History of Education in American Culture*, New York: Henry, Holt and Co., 1953.

Byrne, N., and Quarter, J. *Must Schools Fail?* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1972.

Calhoun, D. (ed.). *The Educating of Americans: A Documentary History*, New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1969.

Chambliss, J.J. (ed.). *Enlightenment and Social Progress: Education in the Nineteenth Century*, Minneapolis, Minnesota: Burgess Pub. Co., 1971.

Cipolla, C.M. *Literacy and Development in the West*, Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1969.

Cohen, M., and Hale, D. (eds.). *The New Student Left*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1967.

Conant, J. *The American High School Today: A First Report to Interested Citizens*, New York: McGraw Hill Co., 1959.

Conant, J. *Slums and Suburbs*, New York: McGraw Hill Co., 1961.

Cook, T.G. (ed.). *History, Sociology and Education*, London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1971.

Coser, L.A. *Masters of Sociological Thought: Ideas in Historical and Social Context*, New York: Harcourt-Brace-Jovanovich, Inc., 1971.

Counts, G.S. *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?* New York: John Day Co., 1932.

Cox, D.W. *The City as Schoolhouse: The Story of the Parkway Programme*, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Judson Press, 1972.

Cremin, L. *The Transformation of the School*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

Cremin, L. *The Genius of American Education*, New York: Vintage Books, 1965.

Cross, K.P. *Beyond the Open Door: New Students in Higher Education*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Pub., 1971.

Dahlke, H.O. *Values in Culture and Classroom*, New York: Harper and Bros., 1958.

Daniels, A. *Academics on the Line*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

Day, H.I., Berlyne, D.E., and Hunt, D.E. *Intrinsic Motivation: A New Direction in Education*, Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Dennison, G. *The Lives of Children*, New York: Random House, 1969.

Dewey, J. *The School and Society*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1915.

Dewey, J. *Human Nature and Conduct*, New York: Henry Holt, 1922.

Dewey, J. *The Child and the Curriculum*, Chicago: Phoenix Books, 1963.

De Young, C.A., and Wynn, R. *American Education*, New York: McGraw Hill Co., 1970.

Draper, H. *The New Student Revolt*, New York: Grove Press, 1966.

Dworkin, M. (ed.). *Dewey on Education*, New York: Columbia University Teachers College, 1961.

Fabun, D. *The Dynamics of Change*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1968.

Finifter, A. (ed.). *Alienation and the Social System*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972.

Fox, L. *Psychology as Philosophy, Science, and Art*, Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Pub. Co., 1972.

Freire, P. *Cultural Action: A Dialectic Analysis*, Cuaderno, Mexico: Centro Intercultural de Documentación, No. 1004, 1970.

Friedenberg, E. *The Vanishing Adolescent*, New York: Dell Pub. Co., 1962.

Friedenberg, E. *Coming of Age in America: Growth and Acquiescence*, New York: Random House, 1965.

Galbraith, J.K. *The New Industrial State*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Co., 1967.

Gelb, J., and Palley, M. *The Politics of Social Change*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971.

Gold, H. (ed.). *First Person Singular: Essays for the Sixties*, New York: The Dial Press, 1963.

Goulet, R. (ed.). *Educational Change: The Reality and the Promise*, New York: Citation Press, 1968.

Greene, M. *The Public School and the Private Vision: A Search for America in Education and Literature*, New York: Random House, 1965.

Greer, C. *The Great School Legend*, New York: Basic Books Inc., 1972.

Gross, B., and Gross, R. *Radical School Reform*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969.

Gross, R. (ed.). *The Teacher and the Taught*, New York: Delta Books, 1963.

Gutek, G.L. *An Historical Introduction to American Education*, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1970.

Gutek, G.L. *A History of Western Educational Experience*, New York: Random House, 1972.

Guthrie, J. *Schools and Inequality*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1971.

Harcleroad, F. *Issues of the Seventies: The Future of Higher Education*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1970.

Havighurst, R.J., and Levine, D.U. *Education in the Metropolitan Areas*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Hayek, F.A. *The Constitution of Liberty*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Henry, J. *Culture Against Man*, New York: Random House, 1963.

Henry, J. *Jules Henry on Education*, New York: Random House, 1971.

Herndon, J. *The Way Its Spozed to be*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1968.

Hertzberg, A., and Stone, E.F. *Schools are for Children: An American Approach to the Open Classroom*, New York: Schocken Books, 1971.

Hillesheim, J.W., and Merrill, G.D. *Theory and Practice in the History of American Education: A Book of Readings*, Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Pub. Co. Inc., 1971.

Hoffman, A. *Revolution for the Hell of It*, New York: Dial Press, 1969.

Holmes, R.M. *The Academic Mystery House: The Man, the Campus and their new search for Meaning*, New York: Abingdon Press, 1970.

Holt, J. *How Children Fail*, New York: Pitman Pub. Corp., 1964.

Holt, J. *The Underachieving School*, New York: Pitman Pub. Co., 1969.

Holt, J. *How Children Learn*, New York: Dell Pub. Co., 1971.

Holt, J. *Freedom and Beyond*, New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., 1972.

Huber, J.T., and Millman, H.L. (eds.). *Goals and Behavior in Psychotherapy and Counselling: Readings and Questions*, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Pub. Co., 1972.

Hurwitz, E., and Maidment, R. (eds.). *Criticism, Conflict and Change: Readings in American Education*, New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1970.

Illich, I. *The Dawn of Epimethean Man, and Other Essays*, Cuernavaca, Mexico: Centro Intercultural de Documentación, 1970.

Illich, I. *Tools for Conviviality*, Cuernavaca, Mexico: Centro Intercultural de Documentación, 1973.

Itzkoff, S.W. *Cultural Pluralism and American Education*, Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Co., 1969.

Jacobs, P., and Landau, S. *The New Radicals: A Report with Documents*, New York: Random House, 1966.

James, D. *The Taming: A Teacher Speaks*, Toronto: McGraw Hill Co., 1969.

Jencks, C. *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America*, New York: Basic Books, 1972/73.

Johnson, J.W. (ed.). *Utopian Literature: A Selection*, New York: Random House, 1968.

Jones, R.M. *Fantasy and Feeling in Education*, London: Harper and Row Pub., 1970.

Kandel, I. *Conflicting Theories of Education*, New York: Macmillan Co., 1938.

Karier, C.J. *Man, Society and Education*, Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1971.

Kateb, G. (ed.). *Utopia*, New York: Atherton Press, 1971.

Katz, J. *Liberating Learning: A Manual for Individualized Educational Reform*, New York: Morgan and Morgan, Inc., 1972.

Katz, M. *The Irony of Early School Reform*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

Katz, J. *School Reform: Past and Present*, Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1971.

Keats, J. *The Sheepskin Psychosis*, New York: Dell Pub. Co., Inc., 1965.

Kenniston, K. *Young Radicals*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968.

Koerner, J.D. *The Miseducation of American Teachers*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1963.

Kohl, H. *36 Children*, New York: Signet Books, 1967.

Kostelanetz, R. (ed.). *Human Alternatives: Visions for Us Now*, New York: William Morrow and Co., Inc., 1971.

Kozol, J. *Death at an Early Age*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1967.

Krimerman, L.I., and Perry, L. (eds.). *Patterns of Anarchy*, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1966.

Kuhn, T. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Laing, R.D. *The Politics of Experience and the Bird of Paradise*, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1969.

Lasch, C. *The Agony of the American Left*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969.

Leeper, R.R. (ed.). *Dare to Care / Dare to Act: Racism and Education*, Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1971.

Leonard, G. *Education and Ecstasy*, New York: Delacorte Press, 1966.

Levine, D., and Havighurst, R.J. (eds.). *Farewell to Schools???* Worthington, Ohio: Charles E. Jones Pub., Co., 1972.

Lipset, S.M., and Wolin, S.S. *The Berkeley Student Revolt: Facts and Interpretations*, Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1965.

Lucas, C.J. *Our Western Educational Heritage*, New York: Macmillan Co., 1972.

Lynd, S. *The Intellectual Origins of American Radicalism*, New York: Pantheon Books, 1968.

Manuel, H. (ed.). *Utopias and Utopian Thought*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966.

Marcuse, H. *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1966.

Martin, J.H., and Harrison, C.H. *Freedom to Learn: Unlocking and Ungrading American Education*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Mason, R.E. *Contemporary Educational Theory*, New York: David McKay Co., 1972.

Massialas, B.G. *Education and the Political System*, Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., 1969.

Mayer, M. *The Schools*, New York: Harper and Bros., Pub., 1961.

McGrath, E.J. (ed.). *Prospect for Renewal*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1972.

Merriam, C.E. *The Role of Politics in Social Change*, New York: Johnson Reprint Corp., 1972.

Meyers, E. *Education in the Perspective of History*, New York: Harper and Row, 1960.

Montagu, A. *Education and Human Relations*, New York: Grove Press Inc., 1958.

Morris, T. *The Walk of the Conscious Ants*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972.

Morrison, T., and Burton, A. *Options: Reforms and Alternatives for Canadian Education*, Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Ltd., 1973.

Muller, H.J. *The Children of Frankenstein: A Primer on Modern Technology and Human Values*, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1970.

Nietzsche, F. *The Birth of Tragedy*, Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1956.

Noar, G. *Individualized Instruction: Every Kid a Winner*, New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1972.

Nyquist, E.B., and Hawes, G.R. (eds.). *Open Education: A Sourcebook for Parents and Teachers*, New York: Bantam Books, 1972.

O'Neill, W.F. *Reading, Ritin, and Rafferty!: A Study of Educational Fundamentalism*, Berkeley, California: Glendessary Press, 1969.

Orum, A.M. (ed.). *The Seeds of Politics: Youth and Politics in America*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Pearl, A. *The Atrocity of Education*, St. Louis, Missouri: New Critics Press, Inc., 1972.

Pentony, D., Smith, R., and Axen, R. *Unfinished Rebellions*, San Francisco: Jossey Bass Inc., Pub., 1971.

Perkinson, H.J. *The Imperfect Panacea: American Faith in Education, 1865-1965*, New York: Random House, 1968.

Perkinson, H.J. *The Possibilities of Error: An Approach to Education*, New York: David McKay Co., 1971.

Pinkus, P. (ed.). *Jonathan Swift: Gulliver's Travels*, Toronto: Macmillan Co., 1965.

Postman, N., and Weingartner, C. *Teaching as a Subversive Activity*, New York: Delacorte Press, 1969.

Power, E.J. *Evolution of Educational Doctrine: Major Educational Theorists of the Western World*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.

Power, E.J. *Main Currents in the History of Education*, New York: McGraw Hill Co., 1970.

Pratte, E. *Contemporary Theories of Education*, Toronto: Intertext Educational Pub., 1971.

Quinn, E., and Dolan, P. *The Sense of the Sixties*, New York: The Free Press, 1968.

Raywid, M. *The Axe-Grinders*, New York: Macmillan Co., 1962.

Reich, C.A. *The Greening of America*, New York: Random House, 1970.

Reimer, E. *School is Dead: Alternatives in Education*, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1971.

Rippa, S.A. *Education in a Free Society: An American History*, New York: David McKay Co., 1971.

Rosen, F.B. *Philosophic Systems and Education*, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Pub., 1968.

Rosenthal, R., and Jacobson, L. *Pygmalion in the Classroom*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., 1968.

Roueche, J.E., and Pitman, J.C. *A Modest Proposal: Students Can Learn*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Pub., 1972.

Rubinoff, L. (ed.). *Tradition and Revolution*, Toronto: Macmillan Co., 1971.

Sarason, S.B. *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Schwartz, B. *Affirmative Education*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1972.

Schwartz, L.L. *American Education: A Problem-Centred Approach*, Boston: Holbrook Press, 1969.

Schwebel, M. *Who Shall be Educated?* New York: Grove Press Inc., 1968.

Scott, J.P., and Scott, S.F. *Social Control and Social Change*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Sherriffs, A.C., and Clarke, K.B. *How Relevant is Education in America Today?* Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1970.

Siceluff, H.J. (ed.). *Readings in the History of Education*, Berkeley: McCutchen Pub. Co., 1970.

Silberman, C. *Crisis in Black and White*, New York: Random House, 1964.

Silberman, C. *Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education*, New York: Random House, 1970.

Silverman, H.J. (ed.). *American Radical Thought: The Libertarian Tradition*, Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Co., 1970.

Skinner, B.F. *Science and Human Behaviour*, New York: Macmillan Co., 1953.

Skinner, B.F. *The Technology of Teaching*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

Smith, G.K. (ed.). *1945 Twenty Five Years 1970*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1970.

Smith, G.K. (ed.). *New Teaching New Learning*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1971.

Spring, J. *Youth and the Custodial Role of the Schools*, Cuaderno, Mexico: Centro Intercultural de Documentación, No. 1011, 1970.

Stevenson, H.A., Stamp, R.M., and Wilson, J.D. *The Best of Times, The Worst of Times*, Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Stewart, D. *Educational Malpractices: The Big Gamble in our Schools*, Westminster, California: Slate Services Pub., 1971.

Stone, L.J., and Church, J. *Childhood and Adolescence: A Psychology of the Growing Person*, New York: Random House, 1968.

Swift, D.W. *Ideology and Change in the Public Schools*, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Pub. Co., 1971.

Thorndike, E. *Educational Psychology*, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1910.

Turner, J. *Making New Schools*, New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1971.

Turner, R.H., and Killiam, L.M. *Collective Behaviour*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Tyack, D.B. *Turning Points in American Educational History*, London: Blaisdell Pub. Co., 1967.

Vogel, A.W. (ed.). *Foundations of Education: A Social View*, Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1970.

Waller, W. *The Sociology of Teaching*, New York: Russell and Russell, 1932.

Warner, W.L., Havighurst, R.J., and Loeb, M.B. *Who Shall be Educated?* New York: Harper and Bros. Ltd., 1944.

Wax, M.L., Diamond, S., and Gearing, F.O. *Anthropological Perspectives on Education*, New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Weinberg, C. *Education and Social Problems*, New York: The Free Press, 1971.

Weinberg, C. (ed.). *Humanistic Foundations of Education*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1972.

Weldon, L. *Conflicts in our Schools*, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Pub. Co., 1971.

Westby-Gibson, D. *Education in a Dynamic Society: A Contemporary Sourcebook*, Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., 1972.

White, M., and White, L. *The Intellectual Versus the City*, Toronto: Mentor Books, 1962.

Winn, R. (ed.). *John Dewey: A Dictionary of Education*, New York: Philosophical Library, 1959.

Wirt, F.M., and Kirst, M.W. *The Political Web of American Schools*, Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1972.

Woock, R. *Education and the Urban Crisis*, Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Co., 1970.

Woodcock, G. *A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements*, New York: World Pub. Co., 1967.

Yamamoto, K. *Teaching: Essays and Readings*, New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1969.

B. ARTICLES

Berger, M.I. "John Dewey and Progressive Education Today," *School and Society*, Vol. 87, No. 2150, March 28, 1959, pp. 140-142.

Bernbaum, G. "Sociology and Contemporary History," *Education Review*, Vol. 20, No. 3, June 1968, pp. 191-203.

Boulding, K. "The Schooling Industry as a Possible Pathological Section of the American Economy," *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 42, No. 1, Winter 1972, pp. 129-143.

Brickman, W. "Revisionism and the Study of History of Education," *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 4, No. 1, Summer 1964, pp. 209-223.

Bruner, J. "After John Dewey, What?" *Saturday Review*, June 17, 1961, pp. 58-59; 76-78.

Carleton, F. "The School as a Factor in Industrial and Social Problems," *Education*, Vol. 28, No. 2, October 1907, pp. 77-79.

Cass, J. "Pressures for Change," *Saturday Review*, Vol. 54, No. 47, November 20, 1971, pp. 77-78.

Cohen, S. "The Industrial Education Movement, 1906-17," *American Quarterly*, Vol. 20, No. 1, Spring 1968, pp. 95-110.

Cremin, L. "John Dewey and the Progressive Education Movement, 1915-1952," *School Review*, Vol. 67, No. 2, Summer 1959, pp. 160-173.

Cross, K.P. "The New Learners," *Change*, Vol. 5, No. 1, February 1973, pp. 31-35.

Dunn, J. "The Identity of the History of Ideas," *Philosophy*, Vol. 43, No. 164, April 1968, pp. 85-104.

Etzioni, A. "Neo-Liberalism: The Turn of the 60's," *Commentary*, Vol. 48, No. 1, December 1960, pp. 473-479.

Etzioni, A. "Human Beings are not Easy to Change After All," *Saturday Review*, Vol. 55, No. 23, June 23, 1972, pp. 45-47.

Flacks, R. "Student Revolt: 'Result, Not Revolt,'" *Psychology Today*, Vol. 1, No. 6, October,1967, pp. 18-24.

Freire, P. "The Adult Literacy Process as Cultural Action for Freedom," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 40, No. 2, May 1970, pp. 205-225.

Freire, P. "Cultural Action and Conscientization," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 40, No. 3, August 1970, pp. 452-478.

Friedenberg, E. "Current Patterns of Generational Conflict," *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 25, No. 2, 1969, pp. 21-35.

Gersman, E. "Progressive Reform in the St. Louis School Board, 1897," *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 10, No. 1, Spring 1970, pp. 80-92.

Goodlad, J. "The Schools Vs. Education," *Saturday Review*, Vol. 52, No. 16, April 19, 1969, pp. 59-61; 80-81; 83.

Greer, C. "Public Schools: The Myth of the Melting Pot," *Saturday Review*, Vol. 1, No. 2, November 15, 1916.

Griffiths, D.E. "Can Critics Change the Schools?", *Education Digest*, Vol. 38, No. 5, January 1973, pp. 2-5.

Gumbert, E.B. "The City as Educator: How to be Radical Without Even Trying," *Education and Urban Society*, Vol. 4, No. 1, November 1971, pp. 7-24.

Hall, E. "Bad Education: A Conversation with Jerome Bruner," *Psychology Today*, Vol. 4, No. 7, December 1970, pp. 50-51; 70.

Hall, R. "Schools Under Attack," *Education Magazine*, Vol. 29, No. 4, 1972, pp. 7-24.

Hayden, T., "Symposium: Confrontation: The Old Left and the New," *American Scholar*, Vol. 36, No. 4, Autumn 1967, pp. 567-588.

Holborn, H. "The History of Ideas," *American Historical Review*, Vol. 73, No. 3, February 1968, pp. 683-695.

Holmes, M. "A Critique of Neo-Progressive Trends in Canadian Education," *Interchange*, Vol. 2, No. 3, 1971, pp. 63-80.

Huber, B.J., and Bell, W. "Sociology and the Emergent Study of the Future," *American Sociologist*, Vol. 6, No. 1, November 1971, pp. 287-295.

Jackson, B. "Deschooling? No!" *Educational Digest*, Vol. 38, No. 4, December 1972, pp. 2-5.

Jarrett, J.L. "College Students: The New Breed," *Saturday Review*, Vol. 48, Nos. 1 and 2, March 20 and September 11, 1965, pp. 64-65; 75-76.

Karier, C.J. "Liberalism and the Quest for Orderly Change," *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 12, No. 1, Spring 1972, pp. 57-80.

Katz, M. "The Present Moment in Educational Reform," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 41, No. 3, 1971, pp. 342-359.

Kenniston, K. "American Students and the 'Political Revival,'" *American Scholar*, Vol. 32, No. 1, Winter 1962-1963, pp. 40-64.

Kenniston, K. "Sources of Student Dissent," *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 23, No. 3, July 1967, pp. 108-137.

Kobayashi, V. "The Quest for Experience: Zen, Dewey and Education," *Comparative Education Review*, Vol. 5, No. 3, February 1962, pp. 217-222.

Larrabee, H.A. "William James' Impact Upon American Education," *School and Society*, Vol. 89, No. 2187, February 25, 1961, pp. 84-86.

Lazerson, M. "Urban Reform and the Schools: The Kindergarten in Massachusetts, 1870-1915," *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 9, No. 3, Fall 1969, pp. 251-273.

Lergessner, J.G. "Schools and Schooling as Instruments of the Social Control of Individuals: A Plea for Alternatives in Education," Unpublished manuscript, Department of Educational Foundations, University of Alberta, January 1973, 76 pp.

Lilge, F. "The Functionalist Fallacy and the History of Education," *School and Society*, Vol. 65, No. 1684, April 5, 1947, pp. 241-243.

Lipset, S.M., and Dobson, R.B. "The Intellectual as Critic and Rebel: With Special Reference to the United States and the Soviet Union," *Daedalus*, Vol. 101, No. 3, September 1972, pp. 137-198.

MacInnes, C. "Old Youth and Young," *Encounter*, Vol. 29, No. 3, September 1967, pp. 29-35.

MacIver, D.A. "The Tradition of the New Progressives," *Teacher Education*, Vol. 1, No. 4, Spring 1971, pp. 56-57.

May, H.F. "The Student Movement: Some Impressions at Berkeley," *American Scholar*, Vol. 34, No. 3, Summer 1965, pp. 387-399.

Mead, M. "Our Educational Emphasis in Primitive Perspective," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 48, No. 1, June 1960, pp. 633-639.

Messerli, J. "Localism in State Control in Horace Mann's Reform of the Common School," *American Quarterly*, Vol. 17, No. 3, Spring 1965, pp. 104-118.

Messerli, J. "To Broaden Schooling Was to Narrow Education," *Notre Dame Journal of Education*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 1970, pp. 5-16.

Meyerson, M. "The Ethos of the American College Student: Beyond the Protests," *American Scholar*, Vol. 95, No. 3, Summer 1966, pp. 713-739.

Miller, S.I. "Alternative School Systems: Jencks Reexamined," *Intellect*, Vol. 101, No. 2344, November 1972, pp. 102-105.

Morrison, T.R. "The Illusion of Education: Learning and Bureaucratized Schools," *Manitoba Journal of Education*, Vol. 7, No. 2, June 1972, pp. 5-26.

Parr, A.E. "The Child in the City: Urbanity and the Urban Scene," *Landscape*, Vol. 2, No. 1, Spring 1967, pp. 3-5.

Pillsbury, W.B. "Selection: An Unnoticed Function of Education," *Scientific Monthly*, Vol. 12, No. 3, January 1921, pp. 70-71.

Rogers, D. "Pragmatism: The Philosophy of America," *Educational Theory*, Vol. 9, No. 2, October 1959, pp. 207-216; 222.

Semple, W. "Education: Is it Serving the Person or the Market?", *Poundmaker*, Vol. 1, No. 26, April 4, 1973, pp. 9-10.

Silberman, C. "Technology is Knocking on the Schoolhouse Door," *Fortune*, Vol. 74, No. 3, August 1966, pp. 120-125; 198; 203.

Skinner, Q. "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas," *History and Theory*, Vol. 8, No. 1, Summer 1969, pp. 3-53.

Smith, T.L. "Protestant Schooling and American Nationality, 1800-50," *Journal of American History*, Vol. 53, No. 4, March 1967, pp. 695-697.

Spring, J. "Education and Progressivism," *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 10, No. 1, Spring 1970, pp. 53-71.

Staab, F. "The Coming of the Guerilla Teacher," *McGill Journal of Education*, Vol. 5, No. 2, Fall 1970, pp. 133-138.

Turner, C.M. "Sociological Approaches to the History of Education," *British Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 2, June 1969, pp. 146-165.

Tyack, D. "The Kingdom of God and the Common School," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 36, No. 4, Fall 1966, pp. 447-469.

Tyack, D. "Bureaucracy and the Common School: The Example of Portland, Oregon, 1851-1913," *American Quarterly*, Vol. 19, No. 2, Fall 1967, pp. 475-498.

Unger, I. "The 'New Left' and American History: Some Recent Trends in U.S. Historiography," *American Historical Review*, Vol. 72, No. 4, July 1967, pp. 1237-1263.

Van Til, W. "Is Progressive Education Obsolete?", *Saturday Review*, Vol. 45, No. 1, February 17, 1962, pp. 56-57; 82.

Wiebe, R. "The Social Functions of Public Education," *American Quarterly*, Vol. 21, No. 3, Summer 1969, pp. 147-164.

Worth, W. "Tomorrow's Schooling: Chaos or Concord?", *Education Canada*, Vol. 12, No. 4, December 1972, pp. 4-11.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - leaves 291-302, not microfilmed
because of previously copyrighted material.